





**Metro**

July 29, 2008

Sachi Hamai  
Executive Officer  
Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors  
500 W. Temple Room 383  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Countywide Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Dear Ms. Hamai:

Enclosed for filing, pursuant to Elections Code Section 10403, please find copies of the Resolution and Ordinance of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) approving a one-half cent sales tax measure for the November 4, 2008 ballot. Also enclosed is a copy of the Expenditure Plan which is Attachment A to the Ordinance and a copy of the Five-Point Plan which is an attachment to the Resolution. The letter "R" has been submitted to the Registrar Recorder/County Clerk as the letter designated for the sales tax measure.

If you have further questions, please contact Matt Raymond at (213) 922-7355. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this effort.

Sincerely,

Roger Snoble  
Chief Executive Officer

Attachments



1       **RESOLUTION CALLING SPECIAL ELECTION PROPOSING AN ADDITIONAL**  
2       **RETAIL TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAX FOR TRANSPORTATION**  
3       **PURPOSES TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS OF THE COUNTY AT THE**  
4       **SPECIAL ELECTION AND REQUESTING THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE**  
5       **SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE NOVEMBER GENERAL ELECTION**  
6

7       BE IT RESOLVED by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
8       ("Metro"), that, pursuant to Section 130350 of the California Public Utilities Code, a special  
9       election is hereby ordered and called to be held on Tuesday, November 4, 2008, and that  
10      the following Proposition be submitted to the electors of the County of Los Angeles at the  
11      special election.  
12

13      BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Metro requests that the Board of Supervisors of the  
14      County of Los Angeles, State of California, consolidate the special election with the  
15      November General Election and place the Proposition upon the same ballot as shall be  
16      provided for the General Election to be held on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of November 2008, and, that the  
17      same precincts, polling places, and precinct board members as shall be used for the  
18      General Election shall be used for the Special Election pursuant to California Elections Code  
19      Sections 10400 et seq.  
20

1 BALLOT PROPOSITION

2 The exact form of the Proposition as it is to appear on the ballot is as follows:

<b>Traffic Relief. Rail Extensions. Reduce Foreign Oil Dependence.</b>  To: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Synchronize traffic signals;</li><li>• Repair potholes;</li><li>• Extend light rail with airport connections;</li><li>• Improve freeway traffic flow (5, 10, 14, 60, 101, 110, 138, 210, 405, 605, 710);</li><li>• Keep senior / student / disabled fares low;</li><li>• Provide clean-fuel buses;</li><li>• Expand subway / Metrolink / bus service;</li><li>• Dedicate millions for community traffic relief;</li></ul> Shall Los Angeles County's sales tax increase one-half cent for 30 years with independent audits, public review of expenditures, all locally controlled?	<b>YES</b>
	<b>NO</b>

3  
4 EXHIBITS

5 The complete text of the proposed ordinance, including Attachment A, entitled  
6 "Expenditure Plan," is attached as Exhibit 1, and the document entitled "Five Point Plan," is  
7 attached as Exhibit 2. These documents are incorporated herein by reference.

8  
9 PROCLAMATION

10 Pursuant to Section 12001 of the California Elections Code, Metro hereby  
11 PROCLAIMS that a special County-wide election shall be held on November 4, 2008, to  
12 vote upon the Proposition set forth in this resolution. Pursuant to Section 14212 of the  
13 California Elections Code, the polls shall be open for said election from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00  
14 p.m. The Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder shall cause this proclamation to be  
15 published in a daily newspaper of general circulation, printed, published, and circulated in  
16 Los Angeles County, at least one (1) time before the 4<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2008, pursuant to

1 Section 130351 of the California Public Utilities Code and Section 9163 of the California  
2 Elections Code.

#### 3 4 FILING RESOLUTION

5 The Chief Executive Officer of Metro, or his designee, is ordered to file a copy of this  
6 resolution with the Clerk of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and the Los  
7 Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk at least eighty-eight (88) days prior to the  
8 date of the election.

#### 9 10 ANALYSIS OF ORDINANCE

11 The County Counsel of the County of Los Angeles is hereby requested to prepare an  
12 analysis of said ordinance pursuant to Section 130351 of the California Public Utilities Code  
13 and Section 9160 of the California Elections Code.

#### 14 15 CEQA EXEMPTION

16 The California Environmental Quality Act does not apply to this tax proposal, according  
17 to Section 21080(b)(8) and (10) through (13) of the California Public Resources Code, and  
18 Sections 15273, 15275, 15276 and 15378(b) of Title 14 of the California Code of  
19 Regulations.

20 This tax is proposed for the purpose of (1) meeting operating expenses; purchasing or  
21 leasing supplies, equipment or materials; meeting financial reserve requirements; obtaining  
22 funds for capital projects necessary to maintain service within existing service areas; (2)  
23 increasing funds for the existing public transit service programs; (3) instituting or increasing  
24 passenger or commuter services on rail or highway rights of way already in use and/or (4)  
25 the continued development of a regional transportation improvement program.

26 Metro hereby finds that the purpose of this tax includes supplementing existing tax  
27 revenues to meet a demonstrated shortfall due to decreasing federal funding and  
28 increasing transportation costs needed to complete the Los Angeles County transportation  
29 system as set forth in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program, which is  
30 incorporated herein by reference, including funding to meet operating expenses, purchase  
31 or lease of equipment or materials, meet financial reserve needs and requirements and to  
32 obtain funds for capital projects necessary to maintain service within existing service areas  
33 and to assist in meeting stricter air quality standards and accessibility requirements.

1 The Chief Executive Officer of Metro, or his designee, is directed to promptly file a  
2 Notice of Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act.

3  
4 ELECTION/REGISTRAR-RECORDER

5 Metro staff is hereby instructed to cooperate with the Los Angeles County Registrar-  
6 Recorder and to perform or cause to be performed such functions preliminary to the conduct  
7 of the special election as may be agreed upon with the Registrar-Recorder.

8 Pursuant to Section 130351 of the California Public Utilities Code, the cost incurred by  
9 Los Angeles County in conducting the special election shall be reimbursed by Metro.

10 The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors is hereby authorized to canvass the  
11 returns of the special election requested herein to be consolidated with the November 2008  
12 general election.

13 Pursuant to Section 130350 of the California Public Utilities Code, the vote  
14 requirement for the Proposition shall be an affirmative vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the votes  
15 cast on the Proposition.

16  
17 ARGUMENTS

18 Metro hereby authorizes the Chairman of the Board of Directors of Metro to file a  
19 written argument in support of the Proposition and the rebuttal argument.

20  
21 REQUEST FOR LETTER IDENTIFYING PROPOSITION

22 Metro hereby requests that the Registrar-Recorder identify the Proposition as  
23 "Proposition R." In the event that the letter "R" is not available, Metro requests that the  
24 Registrar-Recorder identify the Proposition as "Proposition M." In the event that neither the  
25 letter "R" nor the letter "M" is available, Metro requests that the Registrar-Recorder identify  
26 the Proposition as "Proposition A." In the event that none of the above letters are available,  
27 Metro hereby authorizes the Chief Executive Officer, or his designee, to select a letter  
28 identifying the Proposition.

29  
30 BALLOT PAMPHLET EXHIBITS

31 Metro hereby authorizes the Chief Executive Officer, or his designee, to submit any  
32 exhibits he deems necessary, including Exhibit 1 or Exhibit 2 of this resolution, or excerpts  
33 thereof, to the Registrar-Recorder for inclusion in the ballot pamphlet.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
0  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
0  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

WITHDRAWAL OF PROPOSITION

Metro hereby authorizes the Chief Executive Officer to instruct the Registrar-Recorder to withdraw the Proposition from the November 4, 2008 ballot in the event that the California Legislature adopts any statute that prevents the attached Ordinance from taking effect, or in the event that the California Legislature fails to adopt a statute that provides that the tax proposed by Metro in the Ordinance shall not be considered for the purposes of the combined rate limit established by Section 7251.1 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY

I certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by a majority vote of all members of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, at its meeting held on the 24<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2008.

5

**Proposed One-Half Cent Sales Tax for Transportation  
Outline of Expenditure Categories**  
Sunsets in 30-Years: Fiscal Year (FY ) 2010 - 2039  
(millions)

**ATTACHMENT A**

Subfund	Program	% of Sales Tax (net of administration)	First Year Amount	10-Year Amount	30-Year Amount
Transit Capital	New Rail and/or Bus Rapid Transit Capital Projects - project definition depends on final environmental review process	35%	\$ 241	\$ 2,930	\$ 13,790
Transit Capital	Metrolink Capital Improvement Projects within Los Angeles County (Operations, Maintenance, and Expansion)	3%	\$ 21	\$ 251	\$ 1,182
Transit Capital	Metro Rail Capital - System Improvements, Rail Yards, and Rail Cars	2%	\$ 14	\$ 167	\$ 788
Highway Capital	Carpool Lanes, Highways, Goods Movement, Grade Separations, and Soundwalls	20%	\$ 138	\$ 1,675	\$ 7,880
Operations	Rail Operations (New Transit Project Operations and Maintenance)	5%	\$ 34	\$ 419	\$ 1,970
Operations	Bus Operations (Countywide Bus Service Operations, Maintenance, and Expansion. Suspend a scheduled July 1, 2009 Metro fare increase for one year and freeze all Metro Student, Senior, Disabled, and Medicare fares through June 30, 2013 by instead using Metro's Formula Allocation Procedure share of this subfund.)	20%	\$ 138	\$ 1,675	\$ 7,880
Local Return	Major street resurfacing, rehabilitation and reconstruction; pothole repair; left turn signals; bikeways; pedestrian improvements; streetscapes; signal synchronization; and transit. (Local Return to the Incorporated Cities within Los Angeles County and to Los Angeles County for the Unincorporated Area of the County on a Per Capita Basis.)	15%	\$ 103	\$ 1,256	\$ 5,910
<b>TOTAL PROGRAMS</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 689</b>	<b>\$ 8,373</b>	<b>\$ 39,400</b>
1.5% for Administration			\$ 11	\$ 127	\$ 600
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ 700</b>	<b>\$ 8,500</b>	<b>\$ 40,000</b>

**Proposed One-Half Cent Sales Tax for Transportation: Expenditure Plan  
30 Years, Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 - 2039  
As Adopted by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors July 24, 2008**  
(\$ in millions)

**ATTACHMENT A**

for reference only - not priority order	Subfund	Potential Project in Alphabetical Order by Category (project definition depends on final environmental process)	Cost Estimate	New Sales Tax (Assembly Bill 2321)			Other Funds			Funds Available Beginning	Expected Completion			
				Minimum	Additional	Total	Federal Funding	State Funding	Local Funding (Rail is 3% except as noted)					
1	Transit Projects: New Rail and/or Bus Rapid Transit Capital Projects. Could include rail improvements or exclusive bus rapid transit improvements in designated corridors.													
2			Escalated \$											
3		Eastside Light Rail Access (Gold Line)	\$ 30	\$ 30	\$ -	\$ 30	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FY 2010	FY 2013			
4		Exposition Boulevard Light Rail Transit	\$ 1,632 <sup>a</sup>	\$ 925	\$ -	\$ 925	\$ -	\$ 353	\$ 354	FY 2010-12	FY 2013-15			
5		Metro and Municipal Regional Clean Fuel Bus Capital Facilities and Rolling Stock (Metro's share to be used for clean fuel buses)	\$ 150	\$ 150	\$ -	\$ 150	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FY 2010	FY 2039			
6		Regional Connector (links local rail lines)	\$ 1,320	\$ 160	\$ -	\$ 160	\$ 708	\$ 186	\$ 266 <sup>b</sup>	FY 2014-16	FY 2023-25			
7			Current 2008 \$											
8	Transit Capital Projects	Grenshaw Transit Corridor - project acceleration	\$ 1,470	\$ 235.5	\$ 971.5	\$ 1,207	To be determined					\$ 263 <sup>c</sup>	FY 2010-12	FY 2016-18
9		Gold Line Eastside Extension	\$ 1,310	\$ -	\$ 1,271	\$ 1,271						\$ 39	FY 2022-24	FY 2033-35
10		Gold Line Foothill Light Rail Transit Extension	\$ 758	\$ 328	\$ 407	\$ 735						\$ 23	FY 2010-12	FY 2015-17
11		Green Line Extension to Los Angeles International Airport	\$ 200	\$ -	\$ 200	\$ 200						TBD <sup>d</sup>	FY 2010-12	FY 2015-28 <sup>d</sup>
12		Green Line Extension: Redondo Beach Station to South Bay Corridor	\$ 280	\$ -	\$ 272	\$ 272						\$ 8	FY 2028-30	FY 2033-35
13		San Fernando Valley I-405 Corridor Connection (match to total project cost)	TBD	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000						\$ 31	FY 2030-32	FY 2038-39
14		San Fernando Valley North-South Rapidways (Canoga Corridor) - project acceleration	\$ 188	\$ 32 <sup>e</sup>	\$ 150	\$ 182						\$ 6	FY 2010-12	FY 2014-16
15		San Fernando Valley East North-South Rapidways - project acceleration	\$ 70	\$ 68.5 <sup>e</sup>	\$ -	\$ 68.5						\$ 2	FY 2013-15	FY 2016-18
16		West Santa Ana Branch Corridor (match to total project cost)	TBD	\$ -	\$ 240	\$ 240						\$ 7	FY 2015-17*	FY 2025-27*
17		Westside Subway Extension - to be opened in segments	\$ 4,200 <sup>f</sup>	\$ 900	\$ 3,174	\$ 4,074						\$ 126	FY 2013-15	FY 2034-36
18	Capital Project Contingency (Transit)-Escalation Allowance for lines 8-17 to be based on year of construction	\$ 7,331	\$ 173	\$ 3,103	\$ 3,276	\$ 2,200	\$ 1,015	\$ 840 <sup>g</sup>	FY 2010	FY 2039				
19	Total New Rail and/or Bus Rapid Transit Capital Projects		\$ 18,939 <sup>h</sup>	\$ 3,001.5	\$ 10,788.5	\$ 13,790	\$ 2,908	\$ 1,554	\$ 1,965	FY 2010	FY 2039			

Proposed One-Half Cent Sales Tax for Transportation: Expenditure Plan

30 Years, Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 - 2039

As Adopted by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors July 24, 2008

(\$ in millions)

ATTACHMENT A

Subfund	Potential Project in Alphabetical Order by Category (project definition depends on final environmental process)	Cost Estimate	New Sales Tax (Assembly Bill 2321)				Other Funds				Expected Completion	
			Minimum	Additional	Total	Federal Funding	State Funding	Local Funding (Rail is 3% except as noted)	Funds Available Beginning			
Highway Projects: Capital Projects - Carpool Lanes, Highways, Goods Movement, Grade Separations, and Soundwalls												
		Escalated \$										
20		\$ 1,123	\$ 200	\$ 200	\$ 400	\$ 200	\$ 336	\$ 187			As funds become available	
21												
22	Alameda Corridor East Grade Separations Phase II	\$ 35	-	\$ 35	\$ 35	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			As funds become available	
23	BNSF Grade Separations in Gateway Cities	\$ 250	250	\$ -	\$ 250	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			FY 2010	FY 2039
24	Countywide Soundwall Construction (Metro regional list and Monterey Park/SR-60)											
25	High Desert Corridor (environmental)	\$ 33	-	\$ 33	\$ 33	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			As funds become available	
26	Interstate 5 / St. Route 14 Capacity Enhancement	\$ 161	90.8	\$ -	90.8	\$ 15	\$ 41	\$ 14			FY 2010	FY 2013-15
27	Interstate 5 Capacity Enhancement from I-605 to Orange County Line	\$ 1,240	264.8	\$ -	264.8	\$ 78	\$ 834	\$ 63			FY 2010	FY 2016-17
28	I-5 Capacity Enhancement from SR-134 to SR-170	\$ 610	271.5	\$ -	271.5	\$ 50	\$ 264	\$ 24			FY 2010	FY 2013
29	I-5 Carmenita Road Interchange Improvement	\$ 389	138	\$ -	138	\$ 97	\$ 154	\$ -			FY 2010	FY 2015
30		Current 2008 \$										
31	Highway Operational Improvements in Arroyo Verdugo subregion	\$ 170	-	\$ 170	\$ 170							
32	Highway Operational Improvements in Las Virgenes/Malibu subregion	\$ 175	-	\$ 175	\$ 175							
33	Interstate 405, I-110, I-105, and SR-91 Ramp and Interchange Improvements (South Bay)	\$ 906	-	\$ 906	\$ 906							
34	Interstate 5 North Capacity Enhancements from SR-14 to Kern County Line (Truck Lanes)	\$ 2,800	-	\$ 410	\$ 410							
35	Interstate 605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchanges	\$ 2,410	-	\$ 590	\$ 590							
36	Interstate 710 North Gap Closure (tunnel)	\$ 3,730	-	\$ 780	\$ 780							
37	Interstate 710 South and/or Early Action Projects	\$ 5,460	-	\$ 590	\$ 590							
38	State Route 138 Capacity Enhancements	\$ 270	-	\$ 200	\$ 200							
39	Capital Project Contingency (Highway)-Escalation Allowance for lines 31-38 to be based on year of construction	\$ 2,575	-	\$ 2,575.9	\$ 2,576							
40	Total Capital Projects Highway: Carpool Lanes, Highways, Goods Movements, Grade Separations, and Soundwalls	\$ 22,337	\$ 1,215.1	\$ 6,664.9	\$ 7,880	TBD	TBD	\$ 288			FY 2010	FY 2039



**Proposed One-Half Cent Sales Tax for Transportation: Expenditure Plan  
30 Years, Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 - 2039  
As Adopted by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors July 24, 2008**  
(\$ in millions)

**ATTACHMENT A**

Subfund	Operating and Capital Programs	Percent of New Sales Tax Net Revenues	New Sales Tax (Assembly Bill 2321)			Other Funds			Funds Available Beginning	Expected Completion		
			Minimum	Additional	Total Escalated	Federal Funding	State Funding	Local Funding (Rail is 3% except as noted)				
41	Ops	20%	\$ -	\$ 7,880	\$ 7,880 k				FY 2010	FY 2039		
42	Ops	5%	\$ -	\$ 1,970	\$ 1,970 k			Not Applicable	FY 2010	FY 2039		
43	Local Return	15%	\$ 250	\$ 5,660	\$ 5,910 k				FY 2010	FY 2039		
44	Tran. Cap.	2%	\$ -	\$ 788	\$ 788 k				FY 2010	FY 2039		
45	Tran. Cap.	3%	\$ 70	\$ 1,112	\$ 1,182 k				FY 2010	FY 2039		
46	Subtotal Transit and Highway Capital Projects		\$ 41,276 m	\$ 4,216.6	\$ 17,453	\$ 21,670	\$ 2,908	\$ 1,554	\$ 2,253	FY 2010	FY 2039	
47	Subtotal page 4			\$ 320.0	\$ 17,410	\$ 17,730	Not Applicable					
48	1.5% for Administration		N/A	\$ 10	\$ 590	\$ 600					FY 2010	FY 2039
49	Total			\$ 4,546.6	\$ 35,453	\$ 40,000	\$ 2,908	\$ 1,554	\$ 2,253	FY 2010	FY 2039	

- Notes:**
- The Exposition Blvd Light Rail Transit project includes the following funds: Prop 1B Transit Modernization funds (\$250 M), State Transportation Improvement Program funds (\$103 M), Metro Propositions A and C funds (\$354 M).
  - Systemwide ridership forecasts indicate need for a Regional Connector downtown. This expenditure plan assumes that Metro Long Range Transportation Plan funds freed-up from the Exposition Phase II project by passage of this sales tax will be redirected to the Regional Connector project by the Metro Board.
  - Local funding for the Crenshaw Transit Corridor assumes a 3% local contribution (\$44 M) and a Metro Long Range Transportation Plan contribution (\$219 M).
  - Local funding target and project schedule to be determined due to potential LAX contribution. First segment is included in the Crenshaw project.
  - The San Fernando Valley North-South Rapidways minimum of \$100 M is divided between the East and Canoga segments.
  - Unescalated cost estimate to Westwood.
  - Assumes a 3% local contribution to the Escalation Allowance (\$225 M) and a Metro Long Range Transportation Plan contribution for project scheduling risk (\$615 M).
  - Total new rail and/or bus rapid transit capital projects cost estimate subject to change when cost estimates are developed for the San Fernando Valley I-405 Corridor Connection (line 13) and the West Santa Ana Branch Corridor (line 16).
  - The precise amounts of Federal and local funding for the Alameda Corridor East Grade Separations Phase II project are subject to change.
  - For projects funded from other sources on or before December 31, 2008, the funds freed-up by passage of this sales tax shall remain in the subregion in which the project is located for projects or programs of regional significance (per AB 2321).
  - Amounts are estimates. Actual amounts will be based on percentage of actual sales tax receipts net of administration.
  - Local Return to the incorporated cities within Los Angeles County and to Los Angeles County for the unincorporated area of the County on a per capita basis per annual California Department of Finance population data.
  - The total project cost estimate for the transit and highway capital projects of \$41.2 B includes \$12.9 B in as yet unidentified federal, state, local, and public-private partnership funds for highway projects.

Legend: Ops = Operations; Tran. Cap. = Transit Capital; SR = State Route; I = Interstate

\* The West Santa Ana Branch matching funds would be accelerated by utilizing Long Range Transportation Plan resources freed-up by the use of new sales tax funds on the Interstate 5 Capacity Enhancement from I-605 to Orange County Line project (line 27).

## **Measure R and Metro's Five-Point Plan**

1. **RAIL EXPANSION:**  
Expand the county's Metro rail system, including direct airport connection.
2. **LOCAL STREET IMPROVEMENTS:**  
Synchronize signals, fill potholes, repair streets and make neighborhood streets and intersections safer for drivers, bicyclists and pedestrians in each community.
3. **TRAFFIC REDUCTION:**  
Enhance safety and improve traffic flow on LA County freeways and highways.
4. **BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION:**  
Make public transportation more convenient and affordable - especially for seniors, students, disabled and commuters
5. **QUALITY OF LIFE:**  
Provide alternatives to high gas prices, stimulate the local economy, create jobs, reduce pollution and decrease dependency on foreign oil

Note: The proposed measure letter designation of "R" is pending action by the County Registrar Recorder/ County Clerk's Office. Once the final letter is chosen, the Five-Point Plan will be updated accordingly.

## Table of Contents

Introduction	5
Measure R Proposed Projects and Programs by Subregion	8
Rail Expansion	10
1-A Exposition Boulevard Light Rail Transit	10
1-B Crenshaw Transit Corridor (project acceleration)	10
1-C Regional Connector: Links Local Rail Lines	10
1-D Westside Subway Extension	11
1-E Gold Line Eastside Extension	11
1-F Gold Line Foothill Light Rail Transit Extension	11
1-G Green Line Extension: Redondo Beach Station to South Bay Corridor	11
1-H Green Line Extension to Los Angeles International Airport	11
1-I San Fernando Valley North-South Rapidways: Canoga Corridor (project acceleration)	11
1-J San Fernando Valley East North-South Rapidways (project acceleration)	11
1-K West Santa Ana Branch Corridor	11
1-L San Fernando Valley I-405 Corridor Connection	12
1-M Metrolink Capital Improvement Projects (Los Angeles County)	12
1-N Metro Rail Capital Projects	12
I-O Eastside Light Rail Access (Gold Line)	12
Local Street Improvements	13
2-A Signal Synchronization	13
2-B Major Street Resurfacing & Pothole Repair	13
2-C Traffic Monitoring Programs	13
2-D Bicycle Programs	13

2-E	Pedestrian Improvement Program	13
2-F	Safer Bus Stops	13
2-G	Traffic Demand Management	14
<b>Traffic Reduction</b>		<b>15</b>
3-A	I-5 Capacity Enhancement: SR-134 to SR-170	15
3-B	I-5 Capacity Enhancement: I-605 to Orange County Line	15
3-C	I-5/Carmenita Rd. Interchange Improvement	15
3-D	I-5/SR-14 Capacity Enhancement	15
3-E	I-405, I-110, I-105 and SR-91 Ramp and Interchange Improvements: South Bay	15
3-F	I-5 North Capacity Enhancements: SR-14 to Kern County Line (Truck Lanes)	15
3-G	I-710 South and/or Early Action Projects	15
3-H	SR-138 Capacity Enhancements	16
3-I	High Desert Corridor (environmental)	16
3-J	I-605 Corridor “Hot Spot” Interchanges	16
3-K	Highway Operational Improvements in Arroyo Verdugo Subregion	16
3-L	Highway Operational Improvements in Las Virgenes and Malibu Subregion	16
3-M	I-710 North Gap Closure (Tunnel)	16
<b>Better Public Transportation</b>		<b>17</b>
4-A	Rapid Bus Improvements	17
4-B	Express Bus Improvements	17
4-C	Local Bus Improvements	17
4-D	Improved Service for Seniors	17
4-E	Improved Service for the Disabled	17
4-F	Fare Equity	17
4-G	Increased Bus Service to Rail Stations	18

4-H	Expanding Community-Based Shuttle Services	18
4-I	Increased Local Transit Funding	18
<b>Quality of Life</b>		<b>19</b>
5-A	Alternative to High Gas Prices	19
5-B	Significant Economic Impacts	19
5-C	Job Stimulus	19
5-D	Reduced Traffic Congestion	20
5-E	Local Air Quality Improvements	20
5-F	Live/Work Opportunities	20
5-G	BNSF Grade Separations in Gateway Cities	20
5-H	Alameda Corridor East Grade Separations Phase II	20
5-I	Countywide Soundwall Construction	20
5-J	Metro & Municipal Regional Clean Fuel Bus Capital Facilities & Rolling Stock	20
<b>Taxpayer Safeguards &amp; Oversight</b>		<b>21</b>

## Introduction:

### Rough roads ahead....

The one common denominator for everyone who lives and works in Los Angeles County is traffic frustration. By the year 2030, LA County's population is expected to swell to more than 12 million. And growth in international trade will double current truck traffic at our ports.

More people. More cars. More freight. It all means more congestion. In 20 years traffic on local streets will increase 30 percent, and unless we spend more to improve transportation, average freeway speeds could dip below 20 miles per hour.

Today we all waste more than 72 hours a year stuck in traffic, the worst congestion in the nation. Since mobile source emissions are a large contributor to regional smog, it's no surprise we have poor air quality and our children's asthma rates are among the worst in the nation. And we're a major contributor to global warming.

The Los Angeles region lags behind every major North American urban area in the development of a comprehensive mass transit system and that is costing us jobs and undermining our quality of life.

Compounding matters, the state has cut local transportation funding by hundreds of millions of dollars in recent years, while LA County remains a donor on the federal side, sending more transportation tax dollars to Washington than our region gets back.

And this is happening at time when the public is desperate for alternatives to high gas prices. While more than 600 million boarding

passengers annually use public transit in the county, many more would ride trains or express buses or join a carpool or vanpool if they had more options.

### We can improve traffic.....

A massive investment in LA County's transportation infrastructure is necessary to keep up with growth. Measure R is a half-cent sales tax that will provide the local resources to finance new transportation projects and accelerate those already in the pipeline. Over 30 years, it will generate \$40 billion for countywide congestion relief projects – and attract additional state and federal matching funds that will otherwise go to another county.

Here's how Measure R will help us keep pace:

#### Rail Expansion

- Expand the Metro Rail system, including direct airport connection; extend the subway and bring light rail service, Metrolink service and bus service on roadways dedicated for their use to many parts of the county not currently served.

#### Local Street Improvements

- Synchronize signals; fix tens of thousands of potholes; make intersections safer in each community; provide additional street, bridge and sidewalk repairs and construct bikeways and other amenities that encourage walking.

## Traffic Reduction

- Enhance safety and improve traffic flow on LA County freeways and highways and build lanes dedicated for trucks on freeways that experience heavy truck traffic.

## Better Public Transportation

- Make public transportation more convenient and affordable - especially for seniors, students, disabled and commuters; acquire new buses; upgrade bus facilities and expand dial-a-ride service for seniors and the disabled.

## Quality of Life

- Provide alternatives to high gas prices for tens of thousands of commuters and others; generate hundreds of thousands of jobs and \$32 billion in economic activity; reduce air pollution by 4.6 percent over the next 30 years; replace diesel buses with those that run on clean fuels and decrease dependency on foreign oil.

The cost is \$25 a year per person.

According to the private nonprofit Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation (LAEDC), Measure R would cost residents just \$25 per person each year. Compare that to what traffic congestion and poor roads cost us today: the American Automobile Association estimates traffic congestion costs the Los Angeles-Orange County economy \$9.3 billion annually. We lose another \$10.6 billion each year due to roadway collisions, which are a leading cause of congestion. And the national transportation research group TRIP says roads

riddled with potholes cost the average Angeleno \$778 a year in vehicle wear and tear.

We've already come a long way with traffic...

Los Angeles County has made more progress managing congestion in recent years than any large urban area in the nation, despite the addition of 2.5 million residents and the rapid growth of truck traffic moving goods through our Ports.

What's made the difference? A multi-pronged approach that has brought such improvements as:

- More left turn lanes, carpool lanes and traffic signal synchronization, plus services like the Metro Freeway Service Patrol – clearing 300,000 stranded vehicles annually – which save drivers an estimated 57 million hours of delay and more than \$1 billion annually, according to the Texas Transportation Institute.
- An expanded transportation network that now carries more than 600 million passengers annually.
- One of the nation's largest clean-air bus fleet -- more than 2,500 vehicles powered by compressed natural gas. Metro's transit operations, coupled with our rideshare efforts, eliminate 76 tons of air pollutants a day in LA County.

But more is needed...

In this voter information pamphlet, you'll find an overview of the dozens of transportation projects and programs Measure R will make possible.

To ensure that money will be spent in LA County for exactly what voters were promised, Measure R calls for an annual independent audit and report to taxpayers, plus ongoing monitoring and review of spending by an independent taxpayer oversight committee.

But there's one more key element to improving Los Angeles traffic: **individual choice**. Each of us needs to find new ways to commute and to dedicate ourselves to positive change. One way or another, it's really up to you.



## MEASURE R PROPOSED PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS BY SUBREGION

### City of Los Angeles

- 1-A. Exposition Boulevard Light Rail Transit
- 1-B. Crenshaw Transit Corridor (project acceleration)
- 1-C. Regional Connector: Links Local Rail Lines
- 1-D. Westside Subway Extension
- 1-H. Green Line Extension to Los Angeles International Airport
- 1-I. San Fernando Valley North-South Rapidways: Canoga Corridor (project acceleration)
- 1-J. San Fernando Valley East North-South Rapidways (project acceleration)
- 1-L. San Fernando Valley I-405 Corridor Connection
- 1-O. Eastside Light Rail Access (Gold Line)
- 3-A. I-5 Capacity Enhancement: SR-134 to SR-170

### Westside Cities

- 1-A. Exposition Boulevard Light Rail Transit
- 1-C. Regional Connector: Links Local Rail Lines
- 1-D. Westside Subway Extension

### Gateway Cities

- 1-C. Regional Connector: Links Local Rail Lines
- 1-K. West Santa Ana Branch Corridor
- 3-B. I-5 Capacity Enhancement: I-605 to Orange County Line
- 3-C. I-5/Carmenita Rd. Interchange Improvement
- 3-G. I-710 South and/or Early Action Projects
- 3-J. I-605 Corridor “Hot Spot” Interchanges
- 5-G. BNSF Grade Separation in Gateway Cities

### San Gabriel Valley

- 1-C. Regional Connector: Links Local Rail Lines
- 1-E. Gold Line Eastside Extension
- 1-F. Gold Line Foothill Light Rail Transit Extension
- 3-M. I-710 North Gap Closure (Tunnel)
- 5-H. Alameda Corridor East Grade Separations Phase II

### South Bay Cities

- 1-B. Crenshaw Transit Corridor (project acceleration)
- 1-C. Regional Connector: Links Local Rail Lines
- 1-G. Green Line Extension: Redondo Beach Station to South Bay Corridor
- 1-H. Green Line Extension to Los Angeles International Airport
- 3-E. I-405, I-110, I-105 and SR-91 Ramp and Interchange Improvements: South Bay

### North Los Angeles County

- 3-D. I-5/SR-14 Capacity Enhancement
- 3-F. I-5 North Capacity Enhancements: SR-14 to Kern County Line (Truck Lanes)
- 3-H. SR-138 Capacity Enhancements
- 3-I. High Desert Corridor (environmental)

### Arroyo Verdugo

- 3-A. I-5 Capacity Enhancement: SR-134 to SR-170
- 3-K. Highway Operational Improvements in Arroyo Verdugo Subregion

### **Las Virgenes/Malibu**

- 3-L. Highway Operational Improvements in Las Virgenes and Malibu Subregion

### **Regionwide Programs**

- 1-M. Metrolink Capital Improvement Projects (Los Angeles County)
- 1-N. Metro Rail Capital Projects
- 2-A. Signal Synchronization
- 2-B. Major Street Resurfacing & Pothole Repair
- 2-C. Traffic Monitoring Programs
- 2-D. Bicycle Programs
- 2-E. Pedestrian Improvement Program
- 2-F. Safer Bus Stops
- 2-G. Traffic Demand Management
- 4-A. Rapid Bus Improvements
- 4-B. Express Bus Improvements
- 4-C. Local Bus Improvements
- 4-D. Improved Service for Seniors
- 4-E. Improved Service for the Disabled
- 4-G. Increased Bus Service to Rail Stations
- 4-H. Expanding Community-Based Shuttle Services
- 5-I. Countywide Soundwall Construction
- 5-J. Metro and Municipal Regional Clean Fuel Bus Capital Facilities and Rolling Stock

### **Regionwide Benefits**

- 4-F. Fare Equity
- 5-A. Alternative to High Gas Prices
- 5-B. Significant Economic Impacts
- 5-C. Job Stimulus
- 5-D. Reduced Traffic Congestion
- 5-E. Local Air Quality Improvements
- 5-F. Live/Work Opportunities

## 1. Rail Expansion

*Goals: To significantly expand the size of the Metro Rail and busway systems; to accelerate and enhance existing rail and bus projects; to serve more communities.*

Since its inception in 1990, Metro Rail has grown to become one of the largest urban rail systems in the nation. The Metro Blue, Red, Green, Gold and Purple lines cover 73 miles and move nearly 320,000 boardings each day.

Busways that emulate rail by operating buses on dedicated roadways are an important element of the county's transit system. Examples include the Metro Orange Line in the San Fernando Valley dedicated busways along the I-110 Harbor Freeway and the I-10 El Monte freeway. These three busways carry 137,000 passengers a day.

In addition, Metrolink began providing the region with long-distance commuter rail service in 1992. Since then, it has expanded its service to six counties and 512 route miles, with an average of 43,500 passenger trips daily.

Additional rail and busway projects are either under construction or proposed to be built as outlined in Los Angeles County's transportation blueprint, the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). However, the county's needs are far greater than the funding currently available. Therefore, Measure R would accelerate further expansion of the current system.

### 1-A. Exposition Boulevard Light Rail Transit : Culver City to Santa Monica

Construction is currently under way on the Exposition Light Rail Line between downtown Los Angeles and Culver City, with a projected opening date of 2010. Measure R accelerates the extension from Culver City to Santa

Monica. The extension will add 7 to 10 station stops serving the Westside. This project will provide an alternative to the congested Interstate I-10 Santa Monica Freeway. Specific routing and mode will be subject to approved plans developed in cooperation with local jurisdictions and affected communities.

### 1-B. Crenshaw Transit Corridor (project acceleration)

Measure R will accelerate construction of a north-south transit line along the Crenshaw Boulevard Corridor. It will connect five jurisdictions: the cities of Los Angeles, Inglewood, Hawthorne and El Segundo, plus unincorporated portions of Los Angeles County. The project is proposed to provide transit service to significant activity centers and rail facilities, including Los Angeles International Airport, downtown Inglewood, Leimert Park Village, Baldwin Hills and will connect to the Metro Green Line and the Exposition Light Rail Line. Specific routing and mode will be subject to approved plans developed in cooperation with local jurisdictions and affected communities.

### 1-C. Regional Connector: Links Local Rail Lines

Measure R provides a link between the four light rail lines terminating at the edges of Central Los Angeles. The Regional Connector would provide passengers with seamless connections between Long Beach and Pasadena, as well as between Culver City and East Los Angeles. This project benefits the entire region by reducing travel times and minimizing the need for rail transfers. The Regional Connector provides additional stations in Central Los Angeles and enables all county rail and bus service to operate more efficiently and attract higher ridership. Specific routing and mode will be subject to approved plans developed in cooperation with local jurisdictions and affected communities.

#### 1-D. Westside Subway Extension

This project, to be opened in segments, will extend Metro Rail to the Westside. The extension would substantially cut transit travel times; one study estimates a 50% time savings for commuters along this heavily congested corridor. The project serves several major employment centers including Century City and Westwood/UCLA. Specific routing and mode will be subject to approved plans developed in cooperation with local jurisdictions and affected communities.

#### 1-E. Gold Line Eastside Extension

Measure R extends the Metro Gold Line from the Atlantic/Pomona Station now under construction further east. The project area includes the cities of Los Angeles, Montebello, Pico Rivera, Monterey Park, Industry, Downey, Whittier, Commerce, Rosemead, South El Monte, El Monte, Santa Fe Springs and Bell, as well as unincorporated portions of Los Angeles County. It would provide quick and convenient east/west transit access. Specific routing and mode will be subject to approved plans developed in cooperation with local jurisdictions and affected communities.

#### 1-F. Gold Line Foothill Light Rail Transit Extension

Measure R extends Metro's Gold Line from its current terminus in Pasadena at the Sierra Madre Villa station toward Claremont. It will provide a viable alternative to the heavily congested I-210 Freeway. Specific routing and mode will be subject to approved plans developed in cooperation with local jurisdictions and affected communities.

#### 1-G. Green Line Extension: Redondo Beach Station to South Bay Corridor

Measure R continues the Metro Green Line from its current terminus on Marine Avenue

in Redondo Beach to the South Bay Galleria. It will provide a viable alternative to the heavily congested I-405 Freeway. Specific routing and mode will be subject to approved plans developed in cooperation with local jurisdictions and affected communities.

#### 1-H. Green Line Extension to Los Angeles International Airport

Measure R connects the Metro Green Line with LAX from the Aviation Station. It will provide a viable alternative to the heavily congested I-105 and I-405 freeways. Specific routing and mode will be subject to approved plans developed in cooperation with local jurisdictions and affected communities.

#### 1-I. San Fernando Valley North-South Rapidways: Canoga Corridor (project acceleration)

This project extends the Metro Orange Line north from the Canoga Park Station to the Chatsworth Metrolink Station, with new stations at Sherman Way, Roscoe and Nordhoff. Measure R funds will complete this project three years early. The route connects major activity areas in the western San Fernando Valley, including Warner Center, downtown Canoga Park and Chatsworth.

#### 1-J. San Fernando Valley East North-South Rapidways (project acceleration)

Measure R will accelerate bus service improvements on four potential East San Fernando Valley corridors, including Van Nuys, Sepulveda, Reseda and Lankershim. The improvements may include dedicated bus lanes, either all day or during peak hours only.

#### 1-K. West Santa Ana Branch Corridor

Measure R will provide for the development of an environmentally friendly grade-separated transit corridor that also will allow for

pedestrian and bicycle uses. Phase I will go from the Los Angeles County line toward downtown Los Angeles. It will provide a viable alternative to the heavily congested I-5 Freeway. The complete project could ultimately extend from Orange County to the High Desert area.

1-L. San Fernando Valley I-405 Corridor Connection

Measure R improves traffic flow between the Westside and San Fernando Valley by providing a rapid transit option through the Sepulveda Pass. This project will serve the I-405 corridor from the San Fernando Valley to Westwood. It will provide a viable alternative to driving on that heavily congested freeway. Specific modes and routing will be subject to approved plans developed in cooperation with local jurisdictions and affected communities.

1-M. Metrolink Capital Improvement Projects (Los Angeles County)

The Metrolink system provides high-speed, long-distance regional commuter rail service with 512 route miles across six counties. To implement service expansion and safety enhancements, Metrolink will purchase additional clean trains, expand the Eastern Maintenance Facility and construct or upgrade sidings and crossovers to increase speed and safety. Local jurisdictions also will have the opportunity to make improvements to parking and facilities at stations within their cities and offer shuttle services connecting to the Metrolink system. Specific enhancements will be subject to approved plans developed in cooperation with local jurisdictions and affected communities.

1-N. Metro Rail Capital Projects

Measure R will help maintain rail facilities through improvements to operational systems, upgrades to rail yards and purchase of new rail cars.

1-O. Eastside Light Rail Access (Gold Line)

These improvements to be provided by Measure R will increase access, including pedestrian and bicycle, to the Gold Line Eastside Light Rail project, thereby increasing ridership potential for the line.

## 2. Local Street Improvements

*Goals: To synchronize traffic signals to ease traffic flow; to accelerate pothole repair and other maintenance on local streets; to make neighborhood streets and intersections safer for drivers, bicyclists and pedestrians in each community.*

The care and maintenance of local streets is handled by various entities throughout the county's 88 cities and its unincorporated areas. Simple and complex traffic maintenance is outpacing the county's current capacity. The "local return" programs described in this section would provide \$5.9 billion to these local jurisdictions to make transportation improvements in their respective areas. Therefore Measure R would accelerate upgrades to streets, transit and traffic flow at the local level with projects such as the following.

### 2-A. Signal Synchronization

Measure R enables coordinated operation of traffic signals including left-turn arrows at intersections throughout the county. The goal is to improve traffic flow by coordinating signals along major roadways. This effort can increase the capacity of the street grid and significantly reduce delays.

### 2-B. Major Street Resurfacing & Pothole Repair

Many areas of the county currently have extensive backlogs of street maintenance, with anticipated repair time running years in the future. Measure R provides for accelerated repair of potholes and other street and curb damage. Specific maintenance plans will be developed by local jurisdictions.

### 2-C. Traffic Monitoring Programs

Measure R provides for expanded development of the regional traffic monitoring systems, providing continuous and real-time traffic congestion and incident data flow both to traffic control centers and the general public. Specific improvements will be developed by local jurisdictions.

### 2-D. Bicycle Programs

Measure R provides for the development of bicycle facilities throughout Los Angeles County. Each trip made by bicycle reduces traffic congestion while producing zero emissions as no fossil fuels are used. Specific improvements will be developed by local jurisdictions.

### 2-E. Pedestrian Improvement Program

Measure R provides for the improvement of the pedestrian environment by retrofitting existing facilities with improved signage and safety components to make walking a more viable option for more people, more often. Specific improvements will be developed by local jurisdictions.

### 2-F. Safer Bus Stops

Measure R provides for enhancements to bus stops such as lighting, electronic real-time arrival signage, shelters and electronic surveillance to offer passengers a safer, more comfortable and convenient bus riding experience. Specific improvements will be developed by local jurisdictions.

### 2-G. Traffic Demand Management

Measure R provides for Traffic Demand Management (TDM) strategies that are designed to promote alternatives to drive-alone vehicle travel. They include improving the efficiency of existing transportation infrastructure, eliminating or combining vehicle trips and encouraging the deployment of new technologies that support these

objectives. TDM programs are more localized in nature and are implemented by cities with their local share of sales tax revenues.



### 3. Traffic Reduction

*Goals: To relieve highway traffic congestion throughout Los Angeles County; to enhance highway safety and improve traffic flow.*

Since 1995, Los Angeles County has seen the average annual delay per traveler drop by one hour. Most major cities have seen an increase in driver delay during that period.

While our transportation investments help curb congestion, the challenge of continued growth means that the county must find new ways to ensure that our freeway system stays one step ahead. Measure R ensures that currently planned projects continue while crucial others are added.

Measure R will allow the county to build a more robust highway system by building beyond the projects currently planned or under construction. The following is a list of freeway projects that could be advanced if the measure is approved.

#### 3-A. I-5 Capacity Enhancement: SR-134 to SR-170

Measure R will construct one carpool lane in each direction along the I-5 freeway median between SR- 134 and SR-170 including an access improvement for Empire Avenue. The proposed 9.7-mile project will extend the carpool lanes south of SR-170.

#### 3-B. I-5 Capacity Enhancement: I-605 to Orange County Line

Measure R will construct one carpool lane and one mixed-flow lane in each direction extending 6.4 miles through the cities of Cerritos, La Mirada, Santa Fe Springs and Norwalk. The project includes related interchange reconstruction and arterial modifications.

#### 3-C. I-5/Carmenita Rd. Interchange Improvement

Measure R will remove the existing two-lane structure and construct a new eight-lane interchange with carpool lane on-ramps. The project is located in the cities of Santa Fe Springs and Norwalk between the Alondra Boulevard and Shoemaker Avenue overcrossings and will accommodate the widening of the I-5 in the area.

#### 3-D. I-5/SR-14 Capacity Enhancement

Measure R will provide a direct link for carpoolers between the I-5 and SR-14 freeways to eliminate the need for carpoolers to exit the carpool lanes when switching freeways. Measure R also will reduce delay and increase speed along the I-5 and SR-14 carpool lanes. Direct carpool lane connectors increase safety and reduce congestion in the interchange area by eliminating weaving moves as motorists travel from one freeway to another.

#### 3-E. I-405, I-110, I-105 and SR-91 Ramp and Interchange Improvements: South Bay

Measure R will construct improvements to reduce delays on the freeways. Examples of projects that could be funded include auxiliary lanes and ramp reconfigurations.

#### 3-F. I-5 North Capacity Enhancements: SR-14 to Kern County Line (Truck Lanes)

Measure R will add a carpool lane and a dedicated truck lane in both directions on the I-5 freeway north of SR-14 in the Santa Clarita Valley. It is assumed that partial funding by public/private partnerships will be part of the project plan.

#### 3-G. I-710 South and/or Early Action Projects

Measure R will improve congestion, safety and air quality by upgrading the freeway and improving truck and traffic flows between the



ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach and the SR-60 freeway. Also to be considered are upgrades to the I-710 Freeway between Pacific Coast Highway and downtown Long Beach. It is assumed that partial funding by public/private partnerships will be part of the project plan.

#### 3-H. SR-138 Capacity Enhancements

Measure R will widen SR-138 by adding new lanes in each direction to the San Bernardino County Line.

#### 3-I. High Desert Corridor (environmental)

Measure R provides for initial study of the High Desert Corridor, linking the Antelope Valley to Apple Valley. It is assumed that partial funding by public/private partnerships will be part of the project plan.

#### 3-J. I-605 Corridor “Hot Spot” Interchanges

Measure R provides for improvements to interchanges along the I-605 corridor, such as the I-605/I-10, I-605/SR-60, I-605/I-5, I-605/SR-91 and I-605/I-405 interchanges. Examples of the types of improvements include roadway widening, ramp expansion and added signage within the interchange.

#### 3-K. Highway Operational Improvements in Arroyo Verdugo Subregion

Measure R will construct freeway operational enhancements such as ramp improvements, auxiliary lanes and interchange improvements in such areas as Burbank, Glendale and La Canada/Flintridge.

#### 3-L. Highway Operational Improvements in Las Virgenes and Malibu Subregion

Measure R will construct freeway operational enhancements such as ramp improvements, auxiliary lanes and interchange improvements

in such areas as Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Westlake Village and Malibu.

#### 3-M. I-710 North Gap Closure (Tunnel)

Measure R will extend SR-710 freeway north through a tunnel to relieve congestion on local streets. It is assumed that partial funding by public/private partnerships will be part of the project plan.

## 4. Better Public Transportation

*Goals: To keep public transportation affordable, especially for seniors and the disabled; to expand proven bus transit methods; to extend the convenience of public transportation.*

Los Angeles County's transit providers operate over 4,000 buses and serve 1.6 million boardings daily. Metro also administers funding for specialized dial-a-ride programs for the elderly and disabled.

Measure R provides \$7.88 billion for improving bus service over the next 30 years, plus additional funds to cities for transit improvements such as dedicated bus lanes, higher capacity vehicles, more efficient routing and traffic signal priority.

### 4-A. Rapid Bus Improvements

Measure R will provide for continued operation of the Metro Rapid network with over 400 miles of service throughout Los Angeles County. These lines make fewer stops, follow simpler routes, run more frequently, use low-floor buses to facilitate boarding and are given priority at traffic signals in many locations.

### 4-B. Express Bus Improvements

Measure R will provide for continued operation and expansion of express bus service. Express lines use existing rights-of-way to provide efficient long-distance service.

### 4-C. Local Bus Improvements

Measure R provides improvements in the quality and reliability of local bus service over the next 30 years. Both municipal operators and Metro will make greater use of higher capacity buses to expand system capacity while

limiting operating costs. Local buses also feed passengers to regional transit facilities like rail lines, Metro Rapid stations and Metro Orange Line stations.

### 4-D. Improved Service for Seniors

Measure R provides for the continuation and expansion of efforts such as dedicated hands-on "sampler" buses, large-type mapping and route planning tools, outreach to senior centers and retirement homes, specialized large-type informational materials and audience-appropriate training videos.

### 4-E. Improved Service for the Disabled

Measure R provides for the continuation and expansion of enhancements on buses such as wheelchair lifts or ramps, automated voice enunciators and electronic signage to call out stops for visually and hearing impaired passengers. Specific improvements will be developed by local jurisdictions.

### 4-F. Fare Equity

The per-passenger cost of providing transit service is much higher than the fares that can realistically be charged to riders. As a result, all transit service is subsidized in order to provide alternatives to driving. Measure R will allow Metro to maintain its relatively low fares for at least one-year and will freeze payment options for seniors, students, the disabled and commuters for at least five years. If passed, Measure R will suspend a scheduled July 1, 2009 Metro fare increase for one year and freeze all Metro Student, Senior, Disabled, and Medicare fares through June 30, 2013 by instead using Metro's formula share of operating funds generated by Measure R.

#### 4-G. Increased Bus Service to Rail Stations

Measure R provides for the continuation and expansion of feeder bus lines at various stations to maximize access to rail lines.

#### 4-H. Expanding Community-based Shuttle Services

Measure R provides for the continuation and expansion of Community-based Circulators to broaden service options at the local level.

#### 4-I. Increased Local Transit Funding

Measure R provides for the continuation and expansion of funding to municipal transit operators and other locally-based transit service providers.

## 5. Quality of Life

*Goals: To ensure that people and freight can move freely in Los Angeles County; to enable the local economy to prosper; to enable residents to enjoy safety, clean air and a high quality of life.*

Traffic congestion presents undeniably negative impacts on the quality of life for Los Angeles County residents. This trend can be reversed by investing in new transportation infrastructure and making key operational improvements.

Products destined for local stores and warehouses are shipped by truck on some of the most heavily congested freeways in the county. Studies indicate trade volumes will more than double over the next 30 years, increasing daily port-generated truck trips. More efficient, reliable, and safe transportation of goods is critical to the county's mobility, economic growth and quality of life.

Measure R provides for meeting the region's air quality targets through cleaner-burning fuels, expansion of transit programs, and investment and operational improvements that can keep people, freight, and our economy moving.

### 5-A. Alternative to High Gas Prices

Metro offers an affordable alternative to high gas prices. The expanding high-speed network of rapid buses and trains often are as fast or faster than driving. A Metro Day Pass costs about the same as a gallon of gas currently. Saving at the pump is only the start. When vehicle depreciation, maintenance, insurance, and parking fees are added, it can cost up to an average of \$10,000 a year to drive a car or truck. By comparison, public transit in Los Angeles County costs on average just \$744

while carpooling and vanpools in Los Angeles County average between \$1,400 and \$2,200 per person annually.

### 5-B. Significant Economic Impacts

Mobility is the linchpin of the economy. A recent report by the American Automobile Association estimates that traffic congestion costs the Los Angeles-Orange County region \$9.3 billion plus another \$10.6 billion annually due to traffic accidents, which are a leading cause of congestion. The national transportation research group TRIP adds that rough roads riddled with potholes cost the average Angeleno \$778 a year in vehicle wear and tear, the highest in the nation.

Altogether, this is more than a \$2,000 cost for every man, woman and child living in Los Angeles County. Moreover, the average commuter here spends 72 hours a year idling in traffic, while the *Los Angeles Times* reports that traffic congestion regularly delays about a fifth of commercial trucks in the region, increasing the cost of shipping by 50 to 250 percent, which is passed on to consumers.

Measure R will generate the resources to help ease traffic congestion, and studies have shown that construction of transportation projects will jump-start the Los Angeles area economy.

### 5-C Job Stimulus

Measure R will serve as a direct economic stimulus to our local economy. According to the Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation, Measure R would create over 210,000 new jobs and pump more than \$32 billion into Los Angeles County's local economy.

#### 5-D. Reduced Traffic Congestion

Within the next quarter century, Los Angeles County's population will grow by another 2.4 million people with a lot more cars and trucks jammed onto already congested streets and freeways. Growth in international trade could cause a doubling of truck trips from the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. Without significant investment in transportation infrastructure, average freeway peak speeds could dip below 20 miles-per-hour. That will have a negative ripple effect on the local economy, air pollution and quality of life.

The county's expanding public transit services and rideshare programs are providing more residents with the opportunity to avoid solo driving, which helps reduce regional congestion. Metro supports ridesharing options such as carpooling and vanpooling. Just a small increase in the vehicle occupancy rate -- from 1.1 persons per vehicle to 1.3 persons -- would virtually eliminate regional congestion. Metro also funds carpool lane improvements to reduce travel times for those who carpool, join a vanpool or use freeway express buses.

#### 5-E. Local Air Quality Improvements

Metro has made significant investments in clean air programs and operates one of the largest compressed natural gas (CNG) bus fleets in the nation. Buses fueled by CNG are up to 97 percent cleaner than diesel buses. It is estimated that Metro's and its municipal operator partners' transit operations and other rideshare programs reduce tons of air pollutants a day in Los Angeles County. Further investments in transit, combined with transit-oriented development with pedestrian and bicycle-oriented streets plus clean goods movement strategies, will help Los Angeles County further improve air quality.

#### 5-F. Live/Work Opportunities

With the recent increase of thousands of new housing units at or near public transportation stations throughout the county, more Los Angeles area residents can make a lifestyle choice to live closer to their work and avoid the high cost of commuting. Families with two or more cars can achieve tremendous savings by eliminating one of their vehicles and switching to public transit. Metro bus and rail lines as well as the municipal operators directly serve all major employment centers in the county.

#### 5-G. Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Grade Separations in Gateway Cities

Measure R will provide funds toward the construction of rail and roadway grade separations in the Gateway Cities area at five locations including: Rosecrans Avenue and Marquardt Avenue, Passons Boulevard, Los Nietos Road and Norwalk Boulevard, Lakeland Road and Pioneer Boulevard.

#### 5-H. Alameda Corridor East Grade Separations Phase II

The Alameda Corridor East project provides congestion relief to drivers along a 35-mile stretch of the San Gabriel Valley by constructing bridges or underpasses and improving the operation of other railroad intersections.

#### 5-I. Countywide Soundwall Construction

Measure R will continue to construct soundwall projects for major highway projects to reduce freeway noise levels.

#### 5-J Metro and Municipal Regional Clean Fuel Bus Capital Facilities and Rolling Stock

Measure R will provide for the purchase of clean fuel buses by both Metro and municipal operators.

## Taxpayer Safeguards & Oversight

### Strong Protection of Projects

There are strong safeguards to ensure that Measure R funds will be spent here in Los Angeles County for exactly what voters were promised. The Metro Board is obligated to spend Measure R funds in a timely manner that is consistent with the voters' approval. There will be an annual independent audit and report to taxpayers and ongoing monitoring and review of spending by an independent taxpayer oversight committee.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

## Ordinance # 08-01

### Traffic Relief and Rail Expansion Ordinance

#### PREAMBLE

Mobility in Los Angeles County is a necessity and requires an aggressive, responsible and accountable plan to meet the transportation needs of its more than 10 million residents.

1. **RAIL EXPANSION:**

Expand the county's Metro rail system, including direct airport connection

2. **LOCAL STREET IMPROVEMENTS:**

Synchronize signals, fill potholes, repair streets, and make neighborhood streets and intersections safer for drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians in each community

3. **TRAFFIC REDUCTION:**

Enhance safety and improve flow on L.A. County freeways and highways

4. **BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION:**

Make public transportation more convenient and affordable - especially for seniors, students, disabled and commuters

5. **QUALITY OF LIFE:**

Provide alternatives to high gas prices, stimulate the local economy, create jobs, reduce pollution and decrease dependency on foreign oil

#### SECTION 1. TITLE

This Ordinance shall be known and may be cited as the Traffic Relief and Rail Expansion Ordinance, Imposing a Transactions and Use Tax to be Administered by the State Board of Equalization. The word "Ordinance," as used herein, shall include Attachment A entitled "Expenditure Plan" which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

#### SECTION 2. SUMMARY

This Ordinance provides for the establishment and implementation of a retail transactions and use tax at the rate of one-half of one percent (.5%) for a period of thirty (30) years and an expenditure plan.

#### SECTION 3. DEFINITIONS

1 The following words, whenever used in this Ordinance, shall have the meanings as  
2 set forth below:

3 "Board of Equalization" means the California State Board of Equalization.

4 "Capital Project" means a project or program described in Attachment A as a  
5 "Capital Project."

6 "Expenditure Plan" means that expenditure plan for the revenues derived from  
7 a Sales Tax imposed pursuant to this Ordinance, and any other identified state and  
8 local funding, as required under proposed amended Section 130350.5(f) of the  
9 Public Utilities Code.

10 "Gross Sales Tax" means the amount of Sales Tax collected by the Board of  
11 Equalization pursuant to this Ordinance.

12 "Interest" means interest and other earnings on cash balances.

13 "Metro" or "MTA" means the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation  
14 Authority or any successor entity.

15 "Net Revenues" means Sales Tax Revenues minus any amount expended on  
16 administrative costs pursuant to Section 10.

17 "Sales Tax" means a retail transactions and use tax.

18 "Sales Tax Revenues" means the Gross Sales Tax minus any refunds and any  
19 fees imposed by the Board of Equalization for the performance of functions incident  
20 to the administration and operation of this Ordinance.

#### 21 22 SECTION 4. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

23 This Ordinance is enacted, in part, pursuant to:

24 a. Part 1.6 (commencing with Section 7251) of Division 2 of the California  
25 Revenue and Taxation Code;

26 b. Division 12 (commencing with Section 130000) of the California Public  
27 Utilities Code;

28 c. Proposed amendments to Section 130350.5 of the California Public  
29 Utilities Code adopted during the 2007-2008 legislative session.

#### 30 31 SECTION 5. IMPOSITION OF RETAIL TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAX

32 a. Subject to the limits imposed by this Ordinance, Metro hereby imposes,  
33 in the incorporated and unincorporated territory of Los Angeles County, a Sales Tax  
34 at the rate of one-half of one percent (.5%) for a period of thirty (30) years beginning



1 on the first day of the first calendar quarter commencing not less than 180 days after  
2 the adoption of this Ordinance by the voters.

3 b. This Sales Tax shall be in addition to any other taxes authorized by law,  
4 including any existing or future state or local Sales Tax. The imposition,  
5 administration and collection of the tax shall be in accordance with all applicable  
6 statutes, laws, and rules and regulations prescribed and adopted by the Board of  
7 Equalization.

8 c. Pursuant to proposed amended Section 130350.5(d) of the Public  
9 Utilities Code, the tax rate authorized by this section shall not be considered for  
10 purposes of the combined rate limit established by Section 7251.1 of the Revenue  
11 and Taxation Code.

12 d. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 7262.2 of the Revenue and  
13 Taxation Code, the required provisions of Sections 7261 and 7262 of that Code as  
14 now in effect or as later amended are adopted by reference in this Ordinance.

15 e. This Ordinance incorporates provisions identical to those of the Sales  
16 and Use Tax Law of the State of California insofar as those provisions are not  
17 inconsistent with the requirements and limitations contained in Part 1.6 of Division 2  
18 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

19 f. The Sales Tax shall be administered and collected by the Board of  
20 Equalization in a manner that adapts itself as fully as practicable to, and requires the  
21 least possible deviation from, the existing statutory and administrative procedures  
22 followed by the Board of Equalization in administering and collecting the California  
23 State Sales and Use Taxes.

24 g. This Sales Tax shall be administered in a manner that will be, to the  
25 greatest degree possible, consistent with the provisions of Part 1.6 of Division 2 of  
26 the Revenue and Taxation Code, minimize the cost of collecting the transactions and  
27 use taxes, and at the same time, minimize the burden of record keeping upon  
28 persons subject to taxation under the provisions of this Ordinance.

## 30 SECTION 6. ADMINISTRATION BY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

31 a. CONTRACT WITH STATE. Prior to the operative date, Metro shall  
32 contract with the Board of Equalization to perform all functions incident to the  
33 administration and operation of this Ordinance; provided, that if Metro shall not have  
34 contracted with the Board of Equalization prior to the operative date, it shall

1 nevertheless so contract and in such a case the operative date shall be the first day of  
2 the first calendar quarter following the execution of such a contract.

3 b. TRANSACTIONS TAX RATE. For the privilege of selling tangible  
4 personal property at retail, a tax is hereby imposed upon all retailers in the  
5 incorporated and unincorporated territory of Los Angeles County at the rate of one half  
6 of one percent (.5%) of the gross receipts of any retailer from the sale of all tangible  
7 personal property sold at retail in said territory on and after the operative date of this  
8 Ordinance.

9 c. PLACE OF SALE. For the purposes of this Ordinance, all retail sales are  
10 consummated at the place of business of the retailer unless the tangible personal  
11 property sold is delivered by the retailer or his agent to an out-of-state destination or to  
12 a common carrier for delivery to an out-of-state destination. The gross receipts from  
13 such sales shall include delivery charges, when such charges are subject to the state  
14 sales and use tax, regardless of the place to which delivery is made. In the event a  
15 retailer has no permanent place of business in the State or has more than one place of  
16 business, the place or places at which the retail sales are consummated shall be  
17 determined under rules and regulations to be prescribed and adopted by the Board of  
18 Equalization.

19 d. USE TAX RATE. An excise tax is hereby imposed on the storage, use or  
20 other consumption in Los Angeles County of tangible personal property purchased  
21 from any retailer on and after the operative date of this Ordinance for storage, use or  
22 other consumption in Los Angeles County at the rate of one half of one percent (.5%)  
23 of the sales price of the property. The sales price shall include delivery charges when  
24 such charges are subject to state sales or use tax regardless of the place to which  
25 delivery is made.

26 e. ADOPTION OF PROVISIONS OF STATE LAW. Except as otherwise  
27 provided in this Ordinance and except insofar as they are inconsistent with the  
28 provisions of Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, all of the  
29 provisions of Part 1 (commencing with Section 6001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and  
30 Taxation Code are hereby adopted and made a part of this Ordinance as though fully  
31 set forth herein.

32 f. LIMITATIONS ON ADOPTION OF STATE LAW AND COLLECTION OF  
33 USE TAXES. In adopting the provisions of Part 1 of Division 2 of the Revenue and  
34 Taxation Code:

1                   1.       Wherever the State of California is named or referred to as the  
2       taxing agency, the name of Metro shall be substituted therefor. However, the  
3       substitution shall not be made when:

4                   A.       The word "State" is used as a part of the title of the State  
5       Controller, State Treasurer, State Board of Control, State Board of Equalization, State  
6       Treasury, or the Constitution of the State of California;

7                   B.       The result of that substitution would require action to be  
8       taken by or against Metro or any agency, officer, or employee thereof rather than by or  
9       against the Board of Equalization, in performing the functions incident to the  
10      administration or operation of this Ordinance.

11                  C.       In those sections, including, but not necessarily limited to  
12      sections referring to the exterior boundaries of the State of California, where the result  
13      of the substitution would be to:

14                  i.       Provide an exemption from this Sales Tax with  
15      respect to certain sales, storage, use or other consumption of tangible personal  
16      property which would not otherwise be exempt from this Sales Tax while such sales,  
17      storage, use or other consumption remain subject to tax by the State under the  
18      provisions of Part 1 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, or;

19                  ii.      Impose this Sales Tax with respect to certain sales,  
20      storage, use or other consumption of tangible personal property which would not be  
21      subject to this Sales Tax by the state under the said provision of that code.

22                  D.       In Sections 6701, 6702 (except in the last sentence  
23      thereof), 6711, 6715, 6737, 6797 or 6828 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

24                  2.       The phrase "Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation  
25      Authority or any successor entity" shall be substituted for the word "State" in the  
26      phrase "retailer engaged in business in this State" in Section 6203 and in the definition  
27      of that phrase in Section 6203 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

28                  g.       PERMIT NOT REQUIRED. If a seller's permit has been issued to a  
29      retailer under Section 6067 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, an additional  
30      transactor's permit shall not be required by this Ordinance.

31                  h.       EXEMPTIONS AND EXCLUSIONS.

32                  1.       There shall be excluded from the measure of the transactions tax  
33      and the use tax the amount of any sales tax or use tax imposed by the State of  
34      California or by any city, city and county, or county pursuant to the Bradley-Burns

1 Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Law or the amount of any state-administered  
2 transactions or use tax.

3 2. There are exempted from the computation of the amount of  
4 transactions tax the gross receipts from:

5 A. Sales of tangible personal property, other than fuel or  
6 petroleum products, to operators of aircraft to be used or consumed principally outside  
7 the County in which the sale is made and directly and exclusively in the use of such  
8 aircraft as common carriers of persons or property under the authority of the laws of  
9 this State, the United States, or any foreign government.

10 B. Sales of property to be used outside Los Angeles County  
11 which is shipped to a point outside Los Angeles County, pursuant to the contract of  
12 sale, by delivery to such point by the retailer or his agent, or by delivery by the retailer  
13 to a carrier for shipment to a consignee at such point. For the purposes of this  
14 paragraph, delivery to a point outside Los Angeles County shall be satisfied:

15 i. With respect to vehicles (other than commercial  
16 vehicles) subject to registration pursuant to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section  
17 4000) of Division 3 of the Vehicle Code, aircraft licensed in compliance with Section  
18 21411 of the Public Utilities Code, and undocumented vessels registered under  
19 Division 3.5 (commencing with Section 9840) of the Vehicle Code by registration to an  
20 address outside Los Angeles County and by a declaration under penalty of perjury,  
21 signed by the buyer, stating that such address is, in fact, his or her principal place of  
22 residence; and

23 ii. With respect to commercial vehicles, by registration  
24 to a place of business outside Los Angeles County and declaration under penalty of  
25 perjury, signed by the buyer, that the vehicle will be operated from that address.

26 C. The sale of tangible personal property if the seller is  
27 obligated to furnish the property for a fixed price pursuant to a contract entered into  
28 prior to the operative date of this Ordinance.

29 D. A lease of tangible personal property which is a continuing  
30 sale of such property, for any period of time for which the lessor is obligated to lease  
31 the property for an amount fixed by the lease prior to the operative date of this  
32 Ordinance.

33 E. For the purposes of subparagraphs (C) and (D) of this  
34 section, the sale or lease of tangible personal property shall be deemed not to be

1 obligated pursuant to a contract or lease for any period of time for which any party to  
2 the contract or lease has the unconditional right to terminate the contract or lease upon  
3 notice, whether or not such right is exercised.

4 3. There are exempted from the use tax imposed by this Ordinance,  
5 the storage, use or other consumption in Los Angeles County of tangible personal  
6 property:

7 A. The gross receipts from the sale of which have been  
8 subject to a transactions tax under any state-administered transactions and use tax  
9 ordinance.

10 B. Other than fuel or petroleum products purchased by  
11 operators of aircraft and used or consumed by such operators directly and exclusively  
12 in the use of such aircraft as common carriers of persons or property for hire or  
13 compensation under a certificate of public convenience and necessity issued pursuant  
14 to the laws of this State, the United States, or any foreign government. This exemption  
15 is in addition to the exemptions provided in Sections 6366 and 6366.1 of the Revenue  
16 and Taxation Code of the State of California.

17 C. If the purchaser is obligated to purchase the property for a  
18 fixed price pursuant to a contract entered into prior to the operative date of this  
19 Ordinance.

20 D. If the possession of, or the exercise of any right or power  
21 over, the tangible personal property arises under a lease which is a continuing  
22 purchase of such property for any period of time for which the lessee is obligated to  
23 lease the property for an amount fixed by a lease prior to the operative date of this  
24 Ordinance.

25 E. For the purposes of subparagraphs (C) and (D) of this  
26 section, storage, use, or other consumption, or possession of, or exercise of any right  
27 or power over, tangible personal property shall be deemed not to be obligated  
28 pursuant to a contract or lease for any period of time for which any party to the  
29 contract or lease has the unconditional right to terminate the contract or lease upon  
30 notice, whether or not such right is exercised.

31 F. Except as provided in subparagraph (G), a retailer  
32 engaged in business in Los Angeles County shall not be required to collect use tax  
33 from the purchaser of tangible personal property, unless the retailer ships or delivers  
34 the property into the County or participates within the County in making the sale of the

1 property, including, but not limited to, soliciting or receiving the order, either directly or  
2 indirectly, at a place of business of the retailer in County or through any representative,  
3 agent, canvasser, solicitor, subsidiary, or person in the County under the authority of  
4 the retailer.

5 G. "A retailer engaged in business in Los Angeles County"  
6 shall also include any retailer of any of the following: vehicles subject to registration  
7 pursuant to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 4000) of Division 3 of the Vehicle  
8 Code, aircraft licensed in compliance with Section 21411 of the Public Utilities Code,  
9 or undocumented vessels registered under Division 3.5 (commencing with Section  
10 9840) of the Vehicle Code. That retailer shall be required to collect use tax from any  
11 purchaser who registers or licenses the vehicle, vessel, or aircraft at an address in Los  
12 Angeles County.

13 4. Any person subject to use tax under this Ordinance may credit  
14 against that tax any transactions tax or reimbursement for transactions tax paid to a  
15 district imposing, or retailer liable for a transactions tax pursuant to Part 1.6 of Division  
16 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code with respect to the sale to the person of the  
17 property the storage, use or other consumption of which is subject to the use tax.

18 i. AMENDMENTS. All amendments subsequent to the effective date of this  
19 Ordinance to Part 1 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code relating to sales  
20 and use taxes and which are not inconsistent with Part 1.6 and Part 1.7 of Division 2 of  
21 the Revenue and Taxation Code, and all amendments to Part 1.6 and Part 1.7 of  
22 Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, shall automatically become a part of  
23 this Ordinance, provided however, that no such amendment shall operate so as to  
24 affect the rate of tax imposed by this Ordinance.

25 j. ENJOINING COLLECTION FORBIDDEN. No injunction or writ of  
26 mandate or other legal or equitable process shall issue in any suit, action or  
27 proceeding in any court against the State or Metro, or against any officer of the State  
28 or Metro, to prevent or enjoin the collection under this Ordinance, or Part 1.6 of  
29 Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, of any tax or any amount of tax  
30 required to be collected.

## 31 32 SECTION 7. USE OF REVENUES

33 a. All of the Net Revenues generated from the Sales Tax plus any Interest  
34 or other earnings thereon, less any funds necessary for satisfaction of debt service

1 and related requirements of all bonds issued pursuant to this Ordinance that are not  
2 satisfied out of separate allocations, shall be allocated solely for the transportation  
3 purposes described in this Ordinance.

4 b. Metro shall establish and administer a sales tax revenue fund with  
5 appropriate subfunds to account for the allocation categories defined in this  
6 Ordinance. All Net Revenues and Interest on Sales Tax Revenues shall be credited  
7 into the sales tax revenue fund and credited to the appropriate subfunds pursuant to  
8 the allocation ratios described on page 1 of Attachment A. The moneys in the sales  
9 tax revenue fund shall be available to Metro to meet expenditure and cashflow needs  
10 of the projects and programs described in Attachment A. Metro may expend  
11 additional funds from sources other than the Sales Tax imposed pursuant to this  
12 Ordinance on the projects and programs described in Attachment A. Funds shall be  
13 available for projects and programs described in Attachment A beginning in the fiscal  
14 years identified in Attachment A as "Funds Available Beginning."

15 c. Metro shall establish the following subfunds of the sales tax revenue  
16 fund:

- 17 1. Transit Capital Subfund
- 18 2. Highway Capital Subfund
- 19 3. Operations Subfund
- 20 4. Local Return Subfund

21 d. Funds in the Transit Capital Subfund shall be allocated to Capital  
22 Projects identified in Attachment A as "Transit Projects."

23 1. For those Capital Projects identified in Attachment A as "Transit  
24 Projects" and identified as "Escalated \$," Metro shall expend no less than the amount  
25 of Net Revenues identified in Attachment A as "New Sales Tax – Total" for each  
26 Capital Project so identified.

27 2. For those Capital Projects identified in Attachment A as "Transit  
28 Projects" and identified as "Current 2008 \$," Metro shall expend no less than an  
29 amount of Net Revenues equal to the value of the amount identified in Attachment A  
30 as "New Sales Tax – Total" for each Capital Project so identified. The amount of Net  
31 Revenues equal to the value of the amount identified in Attachment A as "New Sales  
32 Tax – Total" shall be determined by adjusting the amount identified as follows, at the  
33 discretion of Metro:



1                           A.     Up to four percent (4%) annually for the fiscal years 2010  
2 through 2014; and

3                           B.     Up to three percent (3%) annually for the fiscal year 2015  
4 and all fiscal years thereafter.

5                       3.     Metro shall allocate no less than the amount of Net Revenues  
6 identified in Attachment A as "New Sales Tax – Total" for the project identified in  
7 Attachment A as "Capital Project Contingency (Transit)." Funds allocated to "Capital  
8 Project Contingency (Transit)" shall be expended as needed to provide additional  
9 funding for Capital Projects identified in Attachment A as "Transit Projects." Metro  
10 may expend such funds for debt service, excluding payments for principal, to offset  
11 the costs of inflation, or for any other purpose. Metro shall not expend an amount of  
12 Net Revenues from Capital Project Contingency (Transit) that is greater than the  
13 amount permitted in paragraph (d)(2) for any Capital Project.

14                   4.     In the event that a Capital Project identified in Attachment A as a  
15 "Transit Project" is completed without the expenditure of the amount of Net  
16 Revenues allocated by this Ordinance, any surplus Net Revenues allocated to that  
17 Capital Project shall be credited to the Transit Capital Subfund and expended for  
18 Capital Projects located within the same subregion as the project so completed. The  
19 Board of Directors of Metro shall determine by a two-thirds vote whether a Capital  
20 Project is complete.

21           e.     Funds in the Highway Capital Subfund shall be allocated to Capital  
22 Projects identified in Attachment A as "Highway Projects."

23                   1.     For those Capital Projects identified in Attachment A as  
24 "Highway Projects" and identified as "Escalated \$," Metro shall expend no less than  
25 the amount of Net Revenues identified in Attachment A as "New Sales Tax – Total"  
26 for each Capital Project so identified.

27                   2.     For those Capital Projects identified in Attachment A as  
28 "Highway Projects" and identified as "Current 2008 \$," Metro shall expend no less  
29 than an amount of Net Revenues equal to the value of the amount identified in  
30 Attachment A as "New Sales Tax – Total" for each Capital Project so identified. The  
31 amount of Net Revenues equal to the value of the amount identified in Attachment A  
32 as "New Sales Tax – Total" shall be determined by adjusting the amount identified as  
33 follows, at the discretion of Metro:



1                           A.     Up to four percent (4%) annually for the fiscal years 2010  
2 through 2014; and

3                           B.     Up to three percent (3%) annually for the fiscal year 2015  
4 and all fiscal years thereafter.

5                        3.     Metro shall allocate no less than the amount of Net Revenues  
6 identified in Attachment A as "New Sales Tax – Total" for the project identified in  
7 Attachment A as "Capital Project Contingency (Highway)." Funds allocated to  
8 "Capital Project Contingency (Highway)" shall be expended as needed to provide  
9 additional funding for Capital Projects identified in Attachment A as "Highway  
10 Projects." Metro may expend such funds for debt service, excluding payments for  
11 principal, to offset the costs of inflation, or for any other purpose. Metro shall not  
12 expend an amount of Net Revenues from Capital Project Contingency (Highway) that  
13 is greater than the amount permitted in paragraph (e)(2) for any Capital Project.

14                       4.     In the event that a Capital Project identified in Attachment A as a  
15 "Highway Project" is completed without the expenditure of the amount of Net  
16 Revenues allocated by this Ordinance, any surplus Net Revenues allocated to that  
17 Capital Project shall be credited to the Highway Capital Subfund and expended for  
18 Capital Projects located within the same subregion as the project so completed. The  
19 Board of Directors of Metro shall determine by a two-thirds vote whether a Capital  
20 Project is complete.

21                       f.     Funds in the Operations Subfund shall be allocated to the projects and  
22 programs described in Attachment A as "Operations." Metro shall expend the  
23 percentage of Net Revenues identified in Attachment A as "Percent of New Sales  
24 Tax" for each project and program described in Attachment A as "Operations."

25                       g.     Funds in the Local Return Subfund shall be allocated to the projects  
26 and programs described in Attachment A as "Local Return." Metro shall expend the  
27 percentage of Net Revenues identified in Attachment A as "Percent of New Sales  
28 Tax" for each project and program described in Attachment A as "Local Return."

29                       1.     No Net Revenues distributed to a local jurisdiction pursuant to  
30 Paragraph (g) shall be used for other than transportation purposes. Any jurisdiction  
31 that violates this provision must fully reimburse Metro, including Interest thereon, for  
32 the Net Revenues misspent and shall be deemed ineligible to receive Net Revenues  
33 for a period of three (3) years.

2. To the extent that funds are returned to local jurisdictions pursuant to this paragraph, the receipt, maintenance and expenditure of such funds shall be distinguishable in each jurisdiction's accounting records from other funding sources, and expenditures of such funds shall be distinguishable by program or project. Interest earned on funds allocated pursuant to this paragraph shall be expended only for those purposes for which the funds were allocated.

h. Metro may enter into an agreement with the Board of Equalization to transfer Sales Tax Revenues directly to a bond trustee or similar fiduciary, in order to provide for the timely payment of debt service and related obligations, prior to Metro's receipt and deposit of such Sales Tax Revenues into the sales tax revenue fund; provided, however, that such payments of debt service and related obligations shall be allocated to the appropriate Capital Project Contingency line item or to such subfund within the sales tax revenue fund consistent with the expenditure of the proceeds of the corresponding debt.

i. Metro shall propose the projects and programs in Attachment A for inclusion in the Long Range Transportation Plan.

## SECTION 8. OVERSIGHT

a. Commencing with the 2009-2010 fiscal year, and in accordance with Section 8(a)(1) of this Ordinance, Metro shall contract for an annual audit, to be completed within six months after the end of the fiscal year being audited, for the purpose of determining compliance by Metro with the provisions of this Ordinance relating to the receipt and expenditure of Sales Tax Revenues during such fiscal year.

1. Prior to entering into a contract with an auditing firm to perform any audit required under Section 8(a), Metro shall solicit bids from at least three qualified firms. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of performing and publishing any audit required under Section 8(a) of this Ordinance shall be paid from Sales Tax Revenues.

b. There is hereby established a Proposition R Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee of Metro (“Committee”). The Committee shall meet at least twice each year to carry out the purposes of this Ordinance.

c. The Committee shall be comprised of three persons, each of whom shall be a retired Federal or State Judge. Committee members shall be selected as

1 follows: one member shall be appointed by the Los Angeles County Board of  
2 Supervisors; one member shall be appointed by the Mayor of the City of Los  
3 Angeles; and one member shall be appointed by the Los Angeles County City  
4 Selection Committee. The members of the Committee must reside in Los Angeles  
5 County. No person currently serving as an elected or appointed city, county, special  
6 district, state, or federal public officeholder shall be eligible to serve as a member of  
7 the Committee.

8 d. The Committee shall select and consult with an advisory panel when  
9 performing its responsibilities required under this Ordinance. The advisory panel  
10 shall consist of at least one representative, and not more than two, of the following  
11 professions or areas of expertise:

- 12 1. Construction trade labor union representative
- 13 2. Environmental engineer or environmental scientist
- 14 3. Road or rail construction firm project manager
- 15 4. Public and private finance expert
- 16 5. Regional association of businesses representative
- 17 6. Transit system user

18 e. All meetings of the Committee shall be held within Los Angeles County.  
19 All meetings of the Committee shall be held in compliance with the provisions of the  
20 Ralph M. Brown Act (Section 54950 et seq. of the California Government Code).

21 f. Each member of the Committee shall serve for a term of two years, and  
22 until a successor is appointed. No member of the Committee shall be entitled to any  
23 compensation, except that Metro may reimburse actual expenses of members  
24 arising out of the performance of their duties as Committee members.

25 g. Members of the advisory panel may be replaced by the Committee at  
26 any time by a majority vote of the Committee. No member of the advisory panel  
27 shall be entitled to any compensation, except that Metro may reimburse actual  
28 expenses of members arising out of the performance of their duties as advisory  
29 panel members.

30 h. Metro may adopt further guidelines to govern the operations of the  
31 Committee.

32 i. The Committee shall have the following responsibilities:

- 33 1. Review the results of the audit performed pursuant to Section  
34 8(a) of this Ordinance and make findings as to whether Metro has complied with the

1 terms of the Ordinance. Such findings shall include a determination as to whether  
2 recipients of Net Revenues allocated to the Local Return Subfund have complied  
3 with this Ordinance and any additional guidelines developed by Metro pursuant to  
4 Section 9(b).

5 2. Prepare an annual report to the Metro Board of Directors  
6 presenting the results of the annual audit process and any findings made. The report  
7 shall include an assessment of the consistency of the expenditures of Sales Tax  
8 Revenues with this Ordinance, including Attachment A. The Committee shall cause  
9 a summary of the report to be published in local newspapers and the entire report  
10 and annual audit to be made available to every library located within Los Angeles  
11 County for public review. The Committee shall hold a public hearing on each audit  
12 and annual report and shall report the comments of the public to Metro.

13 3. Review any proposed amendments to this Ordinance, including  
14 the expenditure plan, and make a finding as to whether the proposed amendments  
15 further the purpose of this Ordinance. Metro shall make any proposed amendments  
16 available to the Committee at least 30 days prior to any vote to adopt the proposed  
17 amendments.

18 4. Review all proposed debt financing and make a finding as to  
19 whether the benefits of the proposed financing for accelerating project delivery,  
20 avoiding future cost escalation, and related factors exceed issuance and interest  
21 costs.

22 5. Any findings made by the Committee shall be submitted to the  
23 Metro Board of Directors in advance of the next regular Board meeting  
24

## 25 SECTION 9. MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT REQUIREMENTS

26 a. It is the intent of the Legislature, as stated in Public Utilities Code  
27 proposed amended Section 130350.5(e), and Metro, that revenues provided from  
28 this Ordinance to local jurisdictions in Los Angeles County under the projects and  
29 programs described in Attachment A as "Local Return" be used to augment, not  
30 supplant, existing local revenues being used for transportation purposes.

31 b. Metro shall develop guidelines which, at a minimum, specify  
32 maintenance of effort requirements for the local return program, matching funds, and  
33 administrative requirements for the recipients of revenue derived from the Sales Tax.  
34

1                                   SECTION 10. COSTS OF ADMINISTRATION

2           Gross Sales Tax revenues may be appropriated by Metro for administrative  
3 costs, including contractual services; however in no case shall the Gross Sales Tax  
4 revenues appropriated for such costs exceed more than one and one-half percent  
5 (1.5%) of the Gross Sales Tax revenues in any year.  
6

7                                   SECTION 11. AMENDMENTS

8           a.       Metro may amend this Ordinance, including Attachment A, with the  
9 exception of Section 11, for any purpose, including as necessary to account for the  
10 results of any environmental review required under the California Environmental  
11 Quality Act of the individual specific projects listed in Attachment A. Any such  
12 amendments shall be approved by a vote of not less than two-thirds (2/3) of the  
13 Metro Board of Directors. Metro shall hold a public meeting on proposed  
14 amendments prior to adoption. Metro shall provide notice to the Los Angeles County  
15 Board of Supervisors, the city council of each city in Los Angeles County, and the  
16 public of the public meeting and proposed amendments, and provide them with a  
17 copy of the proposed amendments, at least 30 days prior to the public meeting.  
18 Amendments shall become effective forty-five days after adoption.

19           b.       Notwithstanding Section 11(a) of this Ordinance, Metro shall not adopt  
20 any amendment to this Ordinance, including Attachment A, that reduces total Net  
21 Revenues allocated to the sum of the Transit Capital Subfund and the Highway  
22 Capital Subfund. Not more than once in any ten (10) year period commencing after  
23 the year 2019, Metro may adopt an amendment transferring Net Revenues between  
24 the Transit Capital Subfund and the Highway Capital Subfund.

25           c.       Notwithstanding Section 11(a) of this Ordinance, Metro shall not adopt  
26 any amendment to this Ordinance, including Attachment A, that reduces Net  
27 Revenues allocated to the Operations Subfund or the Local Return Subfund.

28           d.       Metro may amend Section 11 of this Ordinance if such amendments are  
29 approved by a vote of not less than two-thirds (2/3) of the Metro Board of Directors  
30 and are approved by a simple majority vote of the electors voting on a measure to  
31 approve the amendment. Metro shall hold a public meeting on proposed  
32 amendments prior to adoption by the Board. Metro shall provide notice to the Los  
33 Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the city council of each city in Los Angeles  
34 County, and the public of the public meeting and proposed amendments, and

1 provide them with a copy of the proposed amendments, at least 30 days prior to the  
2 public meeting. Amendments shall become effective forty-five days after adoption by  
3 the electors.

#### 4 5 SECTION 12. ESTABLISHMENT OF BONDING AUTHORITY

6 Metro is authorized to issue limited tax bonds, from time to time, payable from  
7 and secured by Sales Tax Revenues to finance any program or project in the  
8 Expenditure Plan, pursuant to Sections 130500 et seq. of the Public Utilities Code, and  
9 any successor act. As additional security, such bonds may be further payable from  
10 and secured by farebox revenues or general revenues of Metro, on a basis  
11 subordinate to Metro's existing General Revenue Bonds, or any other available source  
12 of Metro's revenues, in each case as specified in a resolution adopted by a majority of  
13 Metro's Board of Directors. The maximum bonded indebtedness, including issuance  
14 costs, interest, reserve requirements and bond insurance, shall not exceed the total  
15 amount of the Gross Sales Tax. Nothing herein shall limit or restrict in any way the  
16 power and authority of Metro to issue bonds, notes or other obligations, to enter into  
17 loan agreements, leases, reimbursement agreements, standby bond purchase  
18 agreements, interest rate swap agreements or other derivative contracts or to engage  
19 in any other transaction under the Government Code, the Public Utilities Code or any  
20 other law.

#### 21 22 SECTION 13. APPROPRIATIONS LIMIT

23 Article XIIIB of the California Constitution requires certain governmental entities  
24 to establish an annual appropriations limit. This appropriations limit is subject to  
25 adjustment as provided by law. To the extent required by law, Metro shall establish an  
26 annual appropriations limit and expenditures of the retail transactions and use tax shall  
27 be subject to such limit.

#### 28 29 SECTION 14. ELECTION

30 Pursuant to California Public Utilities Code Section 130350, Metro hereby calls  
31 a special election to place this Ordinance before the voters. The ballot language  
32 shall read as follows:

33  
34 **Traffic Relief. Rail Extensions. Reduce Foreign Oil Dependence.**

1  
2 To:

- 3 • Synchronize traffic signals;  
4 • Repair potholes;  
5 • Extend light rail with airport connections;  
6 • Improve freeway traffic flow (5, 10, 14, 60, 101, 110, 138, 210, 405, 605,  
7 710);  
8 • Keep senior / student / disabled fares low;  
9 • Provide clean-fuel buses;  
10 • Expand subway / Metrolink / bus service;  
11 • Dedicate millions for community traffic relief;  
12

13 Shall Los Angeles County's sales tax increase one-half cent for 30 years with  
14 independent audits, public review of expenditures, all locally controlled?  
15

16 SECTION 15. STATUTORY REFERENCES

17 References in this Ordinance to proposed amendments to Section 130350.5 of  
18 the Public Utilities Code are to Section 130350.5 as amended or added by Assembly  
19 Bill 2321 of the 2007-2008 legislative session.  
20

21 SECTION 16. EFFECTIVE AND OPERATIVE DATES

22 a. This Ordinance shall be effective on January 2, 2009, if:

23 1. Two-thirds (2/3) of the electors voting on the measure  
24 authorizing the imposition of the Sales Tax vote to authorize its enactment at the  
25 statewide general election scheduled for November 4, 2008; and

26 2. A California state statute that provides for all of the following is  
27 adopted by the California Legislature and becomes effective prior to January 2,  
28 2009:

29 A. Requires Metro to include in Attachment A the following  
30 projects, programs, and funding levels;

31 i. Exposition Boulevard Light Rail Transit Project from  
32 downtown Los Angeles to Santa Monica. The sum of nine hundred twenty-five million  
33 dollars (\$925,000,000).

1                                   ii.       Crenshaw Transit Corridor from Wilshire Boulevard  
2 to Los Angeles International Airport along Crenshaw Boulevard. The sum of two  
3 hundred thirty-five million five hundred thousand dollars (\$235,500,000).

4                                   iii.       San Fernando Valley North-South Rapidways. The  
5 sum of one hundred million five hundred thousand dollars (\$100,500,000).

6                                   iv.       Metro Gold Line (Pasadena to Claremont) Light  
7 Rail Transit Extension. The sum of seven hundred thirty-five million dollars  
8 (\$735,000,000).

9                                   v.       Metro Regional Connector. The sum of one  
10 hundred sixty million dollars (\$160,000,000).

11                                  vi.       Metro Westside Subway Extension. The sum of  
12 nine hundred million dollars (\$900,000,000).

13                                  vii.       State Highway Route 5 Carmenita Road  
14 Interchange Improvement. The sum of one hundred thirty-eight million dollars  
15 (\$138,000,000).

16                                  viii.       State Highway Route 5 Capacity Enhancement  
17 (State Highway Route 134 to State Highway Route 170, including access improvement  
18 for Empire Avenue). The sum of two hundred seventy-one million five hundred  
19 thousand dollars (\$271,500,000).

20                                  ix.       State Highway Route 5 Capacity Enhancement  
21 (State Highway Route 605 to the Orange County line, including improvements to the  
22 Valley View Interchange). The sum of two hundred sixty-four million eight hundred  
23 thousand dollars (\$264,800,000).

24                                  x.       State Highway Route 5/State Highway Route 14  
25 Capacity Enhancement. The sum of ninety million eight hundred thousand dollars  
26 (\$90,800,000).

27                                  xi.       Capital Project Contingency Fund. The sum of one  
28 hundred seventy-three million dollars (\$173,000,000).

29                                  xii.       Alameda Corridor East Grade Separations. The  
30 sum of two hundred million dollars (\$200,000,000).

31                                  xiii.       MTA and Municipal Regional Clean Fuel Bus  
32 Capital (Facilities and Rolling Stock). The sum of one hundred fifty million dollars  
33 (\$150,000,000).



xiv. Countywide Soundwall Construction (MTA Regional List and Monterey Park/State Highway Route 60). The sum of two hundred fifty million dollars (\$250,000,000).

xv. Local return for major street resurfacing, rehabilitation, and reconstruction. The sum of two hundred fifty million dollars (\$250,000,000).

xvi. Metrolink Capital Improvements. The sum of seventy million dollars (\$70,000,000).

xvii. Eastside Light Rail Access. The sum of thirty million dollars (\$30,000,000).

B. Authorizes Metro to impose an additional one-half of one percent (.5%) Sales Tax in the incorporated and unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County.

C. Provides that any tax imposed by Metro pursuant to the authority granted in the statute shall not be considered for the purposes of the combined rate limit established by Section 7251.1 of the Revenue and Taxation Code; and

3. No California state statute that requires Metro to provide funding from revenues derived from the Sales Tax imposed pursuant to this Ordinance for any projects or programs other than those listed in this Section or provide a level of funding greater than described in this Section, is adopted by the California Legislature in the 2007-2008 legislative session and becomes law.

b. The operative date of the Sales Tax imposed by this Ordinance shall be July 1, 2009, which is the first day of the first calendar quarter commencing not less than 180 days after the adoption of this Ordinance by the voters.

#### SECTION 17. SEVERABILITY

If any tax or provision of this Ordinance is for any reason held invalid or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, that holding shall not affect the validity or enforceability of the remaining taxes or provisions, and Metro declares that it would have passed each part of this Ordinance irrespective of the validity of any other part.

# Proposed One-Half Cent Sales Tax for Transportation Outline of Expenditure Categories

Sunsets in 30-Years: Fiscal Year (FY ) 2010 - 2039  
(millions)

## ATTACHMENT A

Subfund	Program	% of Sales Tax (net of administration)	First Year Amount	10-Year Amount	30-Year Amount
Transit Capital	New Rail and/or Bus Rapid Transit Capital Projects - project definition depends on final environmental review process	35%	\$ 241	\$ 2,930	\$ 13,790
Transit Capital	Metrolink Capital Improvement Projects within Los Angeles County (Operations, Maintenance, and Expansion)	3%	\$ 21	\$ 251	\$ 1,182
Transit Capital	Metro Rail Capital - System Improvements, Rail Yards, and Rail Cars	2%	\$ 14	\$ 167	\$ 788
Highway Capital	Carpool Lanes, Highways, Goods Movement, Grade Separations, and Soundwalls	20%	\$ 138	\$ 1,675	\$ 7,880
Operations	Rail Operations (New Transit Project Operations and Maintenance)	5%	\$ 34	\$ 419	\$ 1,970
Operations	Bus Operations (Countywide Bus Service Operations, Maintenance, and Expansion. Suspend a scheduled July 1, 2009 Metro fare increase for one year and freeze all Metro Student, Senior, Disabled, and Medicare fares through June 30, 2013 by instead using Metro's Formula Allocation Procedure share of this subfund.)	20%	\$ 138	\$ 1,675	\$ 7,880
Local Return	Major street resurfacing, rehabilitation and reconstruction; pothole repair; left turn signals; bikeways; pedestrian improvements; streetscapes; signal synchronization; and transit. (Local Return to the Incorporated Cities within Los Angeles County and to Los Angeles County for the Unincorporated Area of the County on a Per Capita Basis.)	15%	\$ 103	\$ 1,256	\$ 5,910
<b>TOTAL PROGRAMS</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 689</b>	<b>\$ 8,373</b>	<b>\$ 39,400</b>
1.5% for Administration			\$ 11	\$ 127	\$ 600
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>			<b>\$ 700</b>	<b>\$ 8,500</b>	<b>\$ 40,000</b>

**Proposed One-Half Cent Sales Tax for Transportation: Expenditure Plan  
30 Years, Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 - 2039  
As Adopted by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors July 24, 2008**  
(\$ in millions)

**ATTACHMENT A**

for reference only - not priority order	Subfund	Potential Project in Alphabetical Order by Category (project definition depends on final environmental process)	Cost Estimate	New Sales Tax (Assembly Bill 2321)			Other Funds			Funds Available Beginning	Expected Completion			
				Minimum	Additional	Total	Federal Funding	State Funding	Local Funding (Rail is 3% except as noted)					
1	Transit Projects:New Rail and/or Bus Rapid Transit Capital Projects.Could include rail improvements or exclusive bus rapid transit improvements in designated corridors.													
2			Escalated \$											
3		Eastside Light Rail Access (Gold Line)	\$ 30	\$ 30	\$ -	\$ 30	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FY 2010	FY 2013			
4		Exposition Boulevard Light Rail Transit	\$ 1,632 <sup>a</sup>	\$ 925	\$ -	\$ 925	\$ -	\$ 353	\$ 354	FY 2010-12	FY 2013-15			
5		Metro and Municipal Regional Clean Fuel Bus Capital Facilities and Rolling Stock (Metro's share to be used for clean fuel buses)	\$ 150	\$ 150	\$ -	\$ 150	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FY 2010	FY 2039			
6		Regional Connector (links local rail lines)	\$ 1,320	\$ 160	\$ -	\$ 160	\$ 708	\$ 186	\$ 266 <sup>b</sup>	FY 2014-16	FY 2023-25			
7			Current 2008 \$											
8	Transit Capital Projects	Grenshaw Transit Corridor - project acceleration	\$ 1,470	\$ 235.5	\$ 971.5	\$ 1,207	To be determined					FY 2010-12	FY 2016-18	
9		Gold Line Eastside Extension	\$ 1,310	\$ -	\$ 1,271	\$ 1,271						\$ 39	FY 2022-24	FY 2033-35
10		Gold Line Foothill Light Rail Transit Extension	\$ 758	\$ 328	\$ 407	\$ 735						\$ 23	FY 2010-12	FY 2015-17
11		Green Line Extension to Los Angeles International Airport	\$ 200	\$ -	\$ 200	\$ 200						TBD <sup>d</sup>	FY 2010-12	FY 2015-28 <sup>d</sup>
12		Green Line Extension: Redondo Beach Station to South Bay Corridor	\$ 280	\$ -	\$ 272	\$ 272						\$ 8	FY 2028-30	FY 2033-35
13		San Fernando Valley I-405 Corridor Connection (match to total project cost)	TBD	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000						\$ 31	FY 2030-32	FY 2038-39
14		San Fernando Valley North-South Rapidways (Canoga Corridor) - project acceleration	\$ 188	\$ 32 <sup>e</sup>	\$ 150	\$ 182						\$ 6	FY 2010-12	FY 2014-16
15		San Fernando Valley East North-South Rapidways - project acceleration	\$ 70	\$ 68.5 <sup>e</sup>	\$ -	\$ 68.5						\$ 2	FY 2013-15	FY 2016-18
16		West Santa Ana Branch Corridor (match to total project cost)	TBD	\$ -	\$ 240	\$ 240						\$ 7	FY 2015-17*	FY 2025-27*
17		Westside Subway Extension - to be opened in segments	\$ 4,200 <sup>f</sup>	\$ 900	\$ 3,174	\$ 4,074						\$ 126	FY 2013-15	FY 2034-36
18	Capital Project Contingency (Transit)-Escalation Allowance for lines 8-17 to be based on year of construction	\$ 7,331	\$ 173	\$ 3,103	\$ 3,276	\$ 2,200	\$ 1,015	\$ 840 <sup>g</sup>	FY 2010	FY 2039				
19	Total New Rail and/or Bus Rapid Transitt Capital Projects		\$ 18,939 <sup>h</sup>	\$ 3,001.5	\$ 10,788.5	\$ 13,790	\$ 2,908	\$ 1,554	\$ 1,965	FY 2010	FY 2039			

**Proposed One-Half Cent Sales Tax for Transportation: Expenditure Plan  
30 Years, Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 - 2039  
As Adopted by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors July 24, 2008**  
(\$ in millions)

**ATTACHMENT A**

for reference only - not priority order	Subfund	Potential Project in Alphabetical Order by Category (project definition depends on final environmental process)	Cost Estimate	New Sales Tax (Assembly Bill 2321)			Other Funds			Funds Available Beginning	Expected Completion	
				Minimum	Additional	Total	Federal Funding	State Funding	Local Funding (Rail is 3% except as noted)			
20	Highway Projects: Capital Projects - Carpool Lanes, Highways, Goods Movement, Grade Separations, and Soundwalls											
21			Escalated \$									
22		Alameda Corridor East Grade Separations Phase II	\$ 1,123	\$ 200	\$ 200	\$ 400	\$ 200	\$ 336	\$ 187 <sup>i</sup>	As funds become available		
23		BNSF Grade Separations in Gateway Cities	\$ 35	\$ -	\$ 35	\$ 35	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	As funds become available		
24		Countywide Soundwall Construction (Metro regional list and Monterey Park/SR-60)	\$ 250	\$ 250	\$ -	\$ 250	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FY 2010	FY 2039	
25		High Desert Corridor (environmental)	\$ 33	\$ -	\$ 33	\$ 33	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	As funds become available		
26		Interstate 5 / St. Route 14 Capacity Enhancement	\$ 161	\$ 90.8	\$ -	90.8	\$ 15	\$ 41	\$ 14 <sup>j</sup>	FY 2010	FY 2013-15	
27		Interstate 5 Capacity Enhancement from I-605 to Orange County Line	\$ 1,240	\$ 264.8	\$ -	264.8	\$ 78	\$ 834	\$ 63 <sup>j</sup>	FY 2010	FY 2016-17	
28		I-5 Capacity Enhancement from SR-134 to SR-170	\$ 610	\$ 271.5	\$ -	271.5	\$ 50	\$ 264	\$ 24 <sup>j</sup>	FY 2010	FY 2013	
29		I-5 Carmanita Road Interchange Improvement	\$ 389	\$ 138	\$ -	138	\$ 97	\$ 154	\$ - <sup>j</sup>	FY 2010	FY 2015	
30			Current 2008 \$									
31	Highway Capital Projects	Highway Operational Improvements in Arroyo Verdugo subregion	\$ 170	\$ -	\$ 170	\$ 170				As funds become available		
32		Highway Operational Improvements in Las Virgenes/Malibu subregion	\$ 175	\$ -	\$ 175	\$ 175						
33		Interstate 405, I-110, I-105, and SR-91 Ramp and Interchange Improvements (South Bay)	\$ 906	\$ -	\$ 906	\$ 906						
34		Interstate 5 North Capacity Enhancements from SR-14 to Kern County Line (Truck Lanes)	\$ 2,800	\$ -	\$ 410	\$ 410						
35		Interstate 605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchanges	\$ 2,410	\$ -	\$ 590	\$ 590						
36		Interstate 710 North Gap Closure (tunnel)	\$ 3,730	\$ -	\$ 780	\$ 780						
37		Interstate 710 South and/or Early Action Projects	\$ 5,460	\$ -	\$ 590	\$ 590						
38		State Route 138 Capacity Enhancements	\$ 270	\$ -	\$ 200	\$ 200						
39		Capital Project Contingency (Highway)-Escalation Allowance for lines 31-38 to be based on year of construction	\$ 2,575	\$ -	\$ 2,575.9	\$ 2,576						
40	Total Capital Projects Highway: Carpool Lanes, Highways, Goods Movements, Grade Separations, and Soundwalls		\$ 22,337	\$ 1,215.1	\$ 6,664.9	\$ 7,880	TBD	TBD	\$ 288	FY 2010	FY 2039	

**Proposed One-Half Cent Sales Tax for Transportation: Expenditure Plan  
30 Years, Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 - 2039  
As Adopted by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors July 24, 2008**

**ATTACHMENT A**

(\$ in millions)

Subfund	Operating and Capital Programs	Percent of New Sales Tax Net Revenues	New Sales Tax (Assembly Bill 2321)			Other Funds			Funds Available Beginning	Expected Completion
			Minimum	Additional	Total Escalated	Federal Funding	State Funding	Local Funding (Rail is 3% except as noted)		
Ops	Bus Operations (Countywide Bus Service Operations, Maintenance, and Expansion. Suspend a scheduled July 1, 2009 Metro fare increase for one year and freeze all Metro Student, Senior, Disabled, and Medicare fares through June 30, 2013 by instead using Metro's Formula Allocation Procedure share of this subfund.)	20%	\$ -	\$ 7,880	\$ 7,880 k	Not Applicable			FY 2010	FY 2039
Ops	Rail Operations (New Transit Project Operations and Maintenance)	5%	\$ -	\$ 1,970	\$ 1,970 k				FY 2010	FY 2039
Local Return	Major street resurfacing, rehabilitation and reconstruction; pothole repair; left turn signals; bikeways; pedestrian improvements; streetscapes; signal synchronization; and transit.	15% <sup>1</sup>	\$ 250	\$ 5,660	\$ 5,910 k				FY 2010	FY 2039
Tran. Cap.	Metro Rail Capital Projects - System Improvements, Rail Yards, and Rail Cars	2%	\$ -	\$ 788	\$ 788 k				FY 2010	FY 2039
Tran. Cap.	Metrolink Capital Improvement Projects within Los Angeles County (Operations, Maintenance, and Expansion)	3%	\$ 70	\$ 1,112	\$ 1,182 k				FY 2010	FY 2039
Subtotal Transit and Highway Capital Projects		\$ 41,276 <sup>m</sup>	\$ 4,216.6	\$ 17,453	\$ 21,670	\$ 2,908	\$ 1,554	\$ 2,253	FY 2010	FY 2039
Subtotal page 4			\$ 320.0	\$ 17,410	\$ 17,730	Not Applicable				
1.5% for Administration		N/A	\$ 10	\$ 590	\$ 600	Not Applicable			FY 2010	FY 2039
Total			\$ 4,546.6	\$ 35,453	\$ 40,000	\$ 2,908	\$ 1,554	\$ 2,253	FY 2010	FY 2039
Notes:										

Notes:

- The Exposition Blvd Light Rail Transit project includes the following funds: Prop 1B Transit Modernization funds (\$250 M), State Transportation Improvement Program funds (\$103 M), Metro Propositions A and C funds (\$354 M).
- Systemwide ridership forecasts indicate need for a Regional Connector downtown. This expenditure plan assumes that Metro Long Range Transportation Plan funds freed-up from the Exposition Phase II project by passage of this sales tax will be redirected to the Regional Connector project by the Metro Board.
- Local funding for the Crenshaw Transit Corridor assumes a 3% local contribution (\$44 M) and a Metro Long Range Transportation Plan contribution (\$219 M).
- Local funding target and project schedule to be determined due to potential LAX contribution. First segment is included in the Crenshaw project.
- The San Fernando Valley North-South Rapidways minimum of \$100 M is divided between the East and Canoga segments.
- Unescalated cost estimate to Westwood.
- Assumes a 3% local contribution to the Escalation Allowance (\$225 M) and a Metro Long Range Transportation Plan contribution for project scheduling risk (\$615 M).
- Total new rail and/or bus rapid transit capital projects cost estimate subject to change when cost estimates are developed for the San Fernando Valley I-405 Corridor Connection (line 13) and the West Santa Ana Branch Corridor (line 16).
- The precise amounts of Federal and local funding for the Alameda Corridor East Grade Separations Phase II project are subject to change.
- For projects funded from other sources on or before December 31, 2008, the funds freed-up by passage of this sales tax shall remain in the subregion in which the project is located for projects or programs of regional significance (per AB 2321).
- Amounts are estimates. Actual amounts will be based on percentage of actual sales tax receipts net of administration.
- Local Return to the incorporated cities within Los Angeles County and to Los Angeles County for the unincorporated area of the County on a per capita basis per annual California Department of Finance population data.
- The total project cost estimate for the transit and highway capital projects of \$41.2 B includes \$12.9 B in as yet unidentified federal, state, local, and public-private partnership funds for highway projects.

Legend: Ops = Operations; Tran. Cap. = Transit Capital; SR = State Route; I = Interstate

\* The West Santa Ana Branch matching funds would be accelerated by utilizing Long Range Transportation Plan resources freed-up by the use of new sales tax funds on the Interstate 5 Capacity Enhancement from I-605 to Orange County Line project (line 27).



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1

2 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** THANK YOU. MOVED BY KNABE, SECONDED BY  
3 ANTONOVICH; WITHOUT OBJECTION, SO ORDERED. AND THAT'S ON 37.  
4 ON 52 MOVED BY YAROSLAVSKY -- 52.

5

6 **CLERK SACHI HAMAI:** -- HOLDING THIS ITEM.

7

8 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH.

9

10 **SUP. ANTONOVICH:** 52 NOW?

11

12 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** MR. SACHS, WOULD YOU LIKE TO SPEAK ON 52  
13 FIRST?

14

15 **ARNOLD SACHS:** CAN WE HEAR FROM THE SUPERVISOR, PLEASE, FIRST?  
16 AND I BELIEVE THERE'S OTHER PEOPLE.

17

18 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** RIGHT. THERE'S SOME OTHER PEOPLE.

19

20 **ARNOLD SACHS:** I DO HAVE A CARD IN ON ANOTHER ONE, ON 68 AND 1-  
21 A. AND?

22

23 **CLERK SACHI HAMAI:** WE'RE HOLDING THOSE.

24

25 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** THOSE ARE FOR HEARING.





The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors

1

2 **ARNOLD SACHS:** DO YOU WANT TO HOLD THOSE?

3

4 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH?

5

6 **SUP. ANTONOVICH:** HE'S NOT GOING TO TALK? THE PROPOSAL BEFORE  
7 US TODAY IS TO SUPPORT THE SALES TAX PROPOSAL THAT'S BEING  
8 RECOMMENDED BY THE METROPOLITAN TRANSIT AUTHORITY. I HAVE  
9 RESERVATIONS ABOUT THAT BECAUSE IT DOES NOT TREAT THE ENTIRE  
10 COUNTY EQUITABLY IN GIVING THE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDING BASED  
11 UPON THE POPULATION. THIS IS VERY IMPORTANT BECAUSE, ONCE  
12 AGAIN, REGIONS THROUGHOUT LOS ANGELES COUNTY, BE IT NORTH  
13 COUNTY, SOUTH BAY, SAN GABRIEL VALLEY, THE MID CITY AREAS, THE  
14 SAN FERNANDO VALLEY HAVE A GREATER POPULATION, A GREATER  
15 POPULATION BUT WILL BE RECEIVING LESS SALES TAX REVENUES FOR  
16 THEIR NEEDED TRANSPORTATION PROPOSALS. TO GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE,  
17 THE SAN FERNANDO VALLEY, WHILE 14 PERCENT OF THE POPULATION  
18 WOULD ONLY RECEIVE ABOUT 5 PERCENT OF THE FUNDING IN THIS 30-  
19 YEAR TAX, THE WEST SIDE CITIES, WHILE THEY HAVE TWO PERCENT OF  
20 THE POPULATION WOULD BE RECEIVING 9 PERCENT OF THOSE SALES TAX  
21 REVENUES. THE GATEWAY CITIES WOULD BE 19 PERCENT OF THE  
22 POPULATION, YET RECEIVING ABOUT 17 PERCENT. SAN GABRIEL, 19  
23 PERCENT OF THE POPULATION BUT A LITTLE OVER 16 PERCENT OF THE  
24 REVENUES. SOUTH BAY, NORTH COUNTY IS 7 PERCENT OF THE  
25 POPULATION BUT ONLY RECEIVING ABOUT 5.3 PERCENT OF THOSE



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 REVENUES. SO YOU'RE ASKING PEOPLE, ONCE AGAIN, WHO HAVE  
2 CONGESTED NEEDS, CONGESTED HIGHWAYS AND NEED FOR PUBLIC  
3 TRANSPORTATION TO ONCE AGAIN SUBSIDIZE A PROJECT OUTSIDE OF  
4 THEIR JURISDICTION THAT WILL NOT RELIEVE THEIR COMMUNITIES OF  
5 THE TRANSIT NEEDS BUT WILL ADD AND ENHANCE ADDITIONAL  
6 CONGESTION IN THOSE COMMUNITIES. M.T.A. DID NOT ENGAGE THE  
7 SUBREGIONS AND DESIGN A COUNTY-WIDE PLAN THAT HAD A BUY-IN  
8 FROM ALL PARTS OF THE COUNTY. ONCE AGAIN, THIS WAS A PROPOSAL  
9 COMING FROM THE TOP DOWN. AND IT DID NOT COME FROM THE BOTTOM  
10 UP. THEY DELIBERATELY IGNORED THE SUBREGIONS' INPUT. THE  
11 M.T.A. DECIDED TO TAKE LOS ANGELES CITIES' LIST OF PROJECTS  
12 AND THEN THROW A FEW OTHER PROJECTS COUNTY-WIDE TO CREATE WHAT  
13 LOOKED LIKE A REGIONAL PLAN INSTEAD OF GOING DIRECTLY TO THE  
14 SUBREGIONS AND WORK DIRECTLY WITH THEM ON THE PERCENTAGE OF  
15 FUNDINGS FOR THOSE PROJECTS THAT WERE REQUIRED AND NEEDED.  
16 M.T.A. WAS MORE FOCUSED ON THE TIMING OF THE BALLOT DURING A  
17 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION THAN ON THE CONTENT OF THE SALES TAX  
18 MEASURE. IT IS A FAILURE ON M.T.A.'S PART TO PUT TOGETHER A  
19 SALES TAX PLAN THAT MAKES SENSE FOR THE ENTIRE COUNTY. WHEN  
20 THE MEASURE IS DEFEATED IN NOVEMBER, IT'S IMPORTANT THAT THE  
21 M.T.A. GO BACK TO THE SUBREGIONS AND WORK OUT A FAIR DEAL THAT  
22 RESPECTS CURRENT AND FUTURE POPULATIONS, PROVIDES UNALTERABLE  
23 FUNDING EQUITY, PROVIDES FLEXIBILITY IN PROJECT SELECTION,  
24 PROVIDES FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDING LEVERAGED FROM THE SALES  
25 TAX IN AN EQUITABLE ARRANGEMENT. AGAIN, WHAT YOU HAVE HERE IS





**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 A SITUATION WHERE THERE IS NO POPULATION ESCALATION CLAUSE. SO  
2 WHILE THE NORTH COUNTY IS GOING TO DOUBLE IN POPULATION IN THE  
3 NEXT 10 TO 20 YEARS, THERE IS NO ESCALATION CLAUSE. AND THE  
4 SAME CAN BE SAID FOR THE SAN GABRIEL VALLEY AS WELL AS THE  
5 CONTINUED POPULATION GROWTH IN THE MID CITIES AND THE SAN  
6 FERNANDO VALLEY. SO IT WOULD SEEM TO ME THE BEST INTEREST OF  
7 THE TAXPAYERS, IT WOULD BE TO HAVE THIS PROPOSAL VOTED DOWN IN  
8 NOVEMBER AND GO BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD AND ENGAGE THE  
9 COMMUNITY AND THE SUBREGIONS IN DEVELOPING A FAIR PROPOSAL  
10 THAT WILL MEET THE TRANSIT NEEDS AND NOT FEED THE APPETITES OF  
11 THOSE WHO ARE ATTEMPTING TO CREATE SOME PORK BARREL PROJECTS  
12 THAT ARE VERY EXPENSIVE AND WILL TAKE TIME TO BUILD. THERE WAS  
13 AN INTERESTING PROPOSAL TO DEVELOP A CONNECTER ON THE 405  
14 ABOUT A LARGE AMOUNT OF MONEY. THIS IDEA, THIS CONCEPT WAS  
15 NEVER EVEN DISCUSSED, JUST CAME OUT OF THE BLUE. AND VERY  
16 LIKELY THAT MONEY IS GOING TO BE TRANSFERRED OVER TO THE  
17 SUBWAY TO THE SEA. AND AGAIN IT'S THE DOLLARS, THE SAN  
18 FERNANDO VALLEY ONCE AGAIN THAT'S GOING TO BE LEFT WITH THE  
19 TRANSIT PROGRAMS THAT THEY NEED ALONG WITH THE OTHER PARTS OF  
20 THE COUNTY, NORTH COUNTY ESPECIALLY. WE'RE NOT TALKING ABOUT  
21 ENHANCING PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION FOR SANTA CLARITA OR THE  
22 ANTELOPE VALLEY, AND THAT IS NECESSARY IF WE'RE GOING TO  
23 ALLEVIATE THE CONGESTION ON THE 5 AND THE 14 ALONG WITH THE  
24 CONGESTION THAT WE HAVE ON THE 10, THE 5 CONGESTION THAT WE  
25 HAVE ON THE 60, THE 605. AND AGAIN WE NEED TO HAVE A



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM. SO I'M GOING TO VOTE AGAINST PLACING  
2 THIS ON THE NOVEMBER BALLOT. AND IF IT IS PLACED ON THE  
3 NOVEMBER BALLOT, I URGE A NO VOTE SO THAT WE CAN GO BACK AND  
4 GET A REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN THAT EVERYBODY IS PAYING  
5 INTO TO MEET THEIR LOCAL NEEDS.

6

7 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** WE WILL NOW HAVE THE PUBLIC COMMENT. SUN  
8 YOUNG YANG, ESPERANZA MARTINEZ, DAMIEN GOODMAN, AND ARNOLD  
9 SACHS, PLEASE COME FORWARD.

10

11 **SUP. KNABE:** MADAME CHAIR, COULD I ASK COUNTY COUNSEL A  
12 QUESTION AT THIS PARTICULAR POINT? YEAH, AND THE REGISTRAR. IF  
13 THE REGISTRAR COULD JOIN US, AS WELL?

14

15 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** AS SOON AS WE TAKE THE PUBLIC COMMENT.

16

17 **SUP. KNABE:** PARDON ME?

18

19 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** AS SOON AS WE TAKE PUBLIC COMMENT, WE'LL  
20 ASK THE REGISTRAR.

21

22 **SUP. KNABE:** ALL RIGHT. THEN I'LL WAIT TO ASK MY QUESTION.  
23 DEAN, JUST WAIT AND THEN I'LL ASK THE REGISTRAR AS WELL AS  
24 COUNTY COUNSEL I HAVE VERY SPECIFIC QUESTION.

25



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1    **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** STATE YOUR NAME.

2

3    **ESPERANZA MARTINEZ:** MY NAME IS ESPERANZA MARTINEZ, AND I AM  
4    WITH THE BUS RIDERS' UNION. WE'RE HERE TODAY TO ASK THAT THE  
5    BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REJECT THE M.T.A.'S PROPOSAL TO PLACE THE  
6    HALF CENT SALES TAX ON THE NOVEMBER BALLOT. LET US BE VERY  
7    CLEAR: WE WILL NOT TAX OUR WAY OUT OF TRAFFIC. WE WILL NOT TAX  
8    OUR WAY OUT OF GLOBAL WARMING. WE WILL NOT TAX OUR WAY OUT OF  
9    A BUDGET CRISIS WITHOUT HARMING THE MOST VULNERABLE  
10    COMMUNITIES. BUT IT IS POSSIBLE TO TAX THE BACKBONE OF OUR  
11    TRANSIT SYSTEM INTO THE GROUND. SO I'M ASKING YOU ALL TO LOOK  
12    CLEARLY AT WHAT THE CURRENT PROPOSALS OF TAXATION ARE.  
13    M.T.A.'S HALF CENT SALES TAX IN L.A. COUNTY TO FUND PET  
14    PROJECTS THAT WILL RESULT IN THE STARVING OF THE BUS SYSTEM.  
15    THE CITY MOVING TOWARDS FULL FUNDING RECOVERY AND FORCING  
16    RESIDENTS TO PAY TRASH HIKES, PARKING HIKES FOR AN OVERALL  
17    SERVICE REDUCTION AND TODAY THE GOVERNOR IS CALLING FOR AN  
18    IMMEDIATE ONE CENT SALES TAX INCREASE FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS.  
19    SO WE'LL BE TALKING ABOUT 9.75 PERCENT TAXATION. BUDGET  
20    DEFICITS DON'T FALL FROM THE SKY. THEY ARE A RESULT OF  
21    DELIBERATE CHOICES BEING MADE TO FUND THE WAR, TO FUND THE  
22    PRISON POLICE STATE AS WELL AS FUNDING A RAIL AND HIGHWAY  
23    BOONDOGGLE PROJECT. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, THERE IS NO WAY YOU  
24    CAN MOVE FORWARD ON A PLAN TO TAX COUNTY RESIDENTS AS  
25    LEGISLATURES ARE DISCUSSING THE MANY INGREDIENTS THAT WILL GO



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 INTO THIS BOONDOGGLE PIE. ALTERATIONS ARE STILL BEING MADE TO  
2 THE EXPENDITURE PLAN. WHAT IS NEEDED IS AN OVERALL SHIFT IN  
3 THE M.T.A.'S SPENDING PRIORITIES TOWARDS A NEW VISION FOR  
4 URBAN TRANSPORTATION, ONE THAT SUPPORTS THE MOBILITY OF THE  
5 TRANSIT-DEPENDENT WHILE ENCOURAGING SINGLE PASSENGER AUTO  
6 DRIVERS OUT OF THEIR CARS IN ORDER TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GAS  
7 EMISSIONS. NOT ONE THAT MAKES WAY FOR GENTRIFICATION BY  
8 FATTENING THE POCKETS OF DEVELOPERS AND CONTRACTORS. THANK  
9 YOU.

10

11 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** SUN YOUNG YANG?

12

13 **SUN YOUNG YANG:** HELLO. GOOD MORNING, COUNTY BOARD OF  
14 SUPERVISORS. MY NAME IS SUN YOUNG YANG, WITH THE BUS RIDERS'  
15 UNION. AND I'M HERE TODAY TO URGE YOU TO REJECT THE M.T.A.'S  
16 M.T.A.'S HALF CENT SALES TAX MEASURE. WHAT M.T.A. NEEDS IS NOT  
17 ANOTHER SALES TAX BUT CUTTING OF ALL COSTLY RAIL AND HIGHWAY  
18 PROJECTS. THIS SALES TAX WOULD ONLY AGGRAVATE RACIAL  
19 DISCRIMINATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL DEGRADATION, AS IT PROMISES  
20 EVERY COMPETING ELECTORAL INTEREST IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY A  
21 MULTI-BILLION DOLLAR RAIL AND HIGHWAY PROJECT. THAT AMOUNT WAY  
22 ABOVE WHAT THIS TAX GENERATES. THIS TAX IS SCHEDULED TO  
23 GENERATE 40 BILLION FOR THE NEXT 30 YEARS. AND THE PROJECTS  
24 OUTLINED COST ABOUT \$60 BILLION. AND REALISTICALLY SPEAKING,  
25 AS WE KNOW, THE HISTORY OF M.T.A. AND CONSTRUCTION AND COST



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1    OVERRUNS IN GENERAL, WE KNOW THAT THAT AMOUNT IS WAY  
2    UNDERESTIMATED AND IS MORE CLOSE TO \$80 BILLION. SO WHERE ARE  
3    YOU GOING TO GENERATE ANOTHER \$40 BILLION WHILE YOU'RE  
4    PROMISING VARIOUS COMPETING INTERESTS, ALL THE PROJECTS THAT  
5    THEY WANT? AT THE END OF THE DAY, WE KNOW THIS IS A FORMULA  
6    FOR FISCAL MISMANAGEMENT AND REPETITION OF THE EARLY '90S  
7    HISTORY, WHERE THE RAIDING OF BUSSES WAS THE GENERAL PRACTICE  
8    OF M.T.A., AND I KNOW ALL OF YOU WERE THERE AT THE TIME. AND  
9    AT THE END OF THE DAY, BLACK LATINO A.P.I, WORKING CLASS  
10   PEOPLE, THE POOREST OF THE POOR, TRANSIT-DEPENDENT POPULATION  
11   OF L.A. COUNTY WILL BE THE ONES FOOTING THE BILL WITH PUNITIVE  
12   FARE INCREASES AND SERVICE CUTS. WE HAVE NO ILLUSIONS AS BUS  
13   RIDERS WHAT THE SALES TAX WILL GENERATE. EVEN THE SMALL AMOUNT  
14   SET ASIDE FOR BUS OPERATION IS COMPLETELY RAIDABLE WHEN RAIL  
15   PROJECTS RUN OUT OF MONEY, WHICH IS AN INEVITABLE FORMULA  
16   THAT'S WRITTEN BOTH INTO THE BILL AND TO THE HALF CENT SALES  
17   TAX. WHILE VERBAL PROMISES FOR 150 BUSES IN THE NEXT 25 YEARS  
18   DOESN'T COME CLOSE TO ACHIEVING A FIRST CLASS BUS TRANSIT  
19   SYSTEM. THIS PARALLELS THE WRITTEN LEGISLATIVELY MANDATED 20  
20   PERCENT FUNDING FOR HIGHWAY EXPANSION WHICH WE KNOW WILL ONLY  
21   EXACERBATE THE CARBON FOOTPRINT OF THIS REGION. THE FACT IS,  
22   TRYING TO RELIEVE CONGESTION BY BUILDING MORE FREEWAYS IS LIKE  
23   TRYING TO FIX OBESITY BY LOOSENING YOUR BELT. WE KNOW IT'S A  
24   FAILED FORMULA. WHY ARE WE TRYING TO INVEST ANOTHER 20 PERCENT  
25   OF THE \$40 BILLION INTO BUILDING MORE FREEWAYS? AND THE OTHER



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1    THING, IS AFTER OVER 15 YEARS OF INVESTING OVER \$10 BILLION TO  
2    THE LITTLE RAIL EXPANSION THAT WE HAVE TODAY, IT HASN'T --  
3    NONE OF THOSE PROJECTS HAS FULFILLED THE PROMISE OF DECREASING  
4    CONGESTION OR REDUCING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND TOXIC  
5    EMISSIONS THAT AFFECT THE PUBLIC HEALTH OF L.A. COUNTY  
6    RESIDENTS. SO WE KNOW IT'S A FAILED PROJECT. WE NEED A NEW  
7    VISION. AND THAT VISION STARTS FOR BUS CENTER TRANSPORTATION  
8    SYSTEM. THANK YOU.

9

10   **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** THANK YOU. DAMIEN GOODMAN FOLLOWED BY  
11   ARNOLD SACHS.

12

13   **DAMIEN:** DAMIEN GOODMAN THE 18 SOUTH OF THE LAKE COMMUNITY  
14   GROUPS THAT IS THE FIX EXPO CAMPAIGN. AND MUCH DISCUSSION WILL  
15   BE ABOUT THE FUTURE, BUT LET'S TALK ABOUT THE PAST. IN 1998,  
16   LED BY THEIR POLITICIAN ZEV YAROSLAVSKY, THE WEST SIDE  
17   SPEARHEADED THE DEATH OF THE RED LINE SUBWAY EXTENSION TO THE  
18   SEA, AND IN THE PROCESS, TOOK AWAY EAST L.A.'S SUBWAY, FORCING  
19   THEM TO ACCEPT THE PRIMARILY STREET-LEVEL LIGHT RAIL LINE AND  
20   ALL THE SAFETY HAZARDS AND ADVERSE IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH IT.  
21   AFTER THE '98 SUBWAY BAN, DISCUSSION OF AN ELEVATED WILSHIRE  
22   LINE ENDED ALMOST IMMEDIATELY DUE TO THE WILSHIRE CORRIDOR'S  
23   COMMUNITY OPPOSITION TO THE ESTHETIC AND THE NOISE IMPACTS.  
24   THUS, AS A REPLACEMENT, THE EXPO LINE TO RUN AT GRADE THROUGH  
25   THE SOUTH OF LAKE COMMUNITIES AT 35 MILES PER HOUR PAST FOSHAY





**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 LEARNING CENTER AND 55 MILES PER HOUR PAST DORSEY WAS ERECTED.  
2 IN JANUARY OF 2008, JUST THIS YEAR, AFTER DECADES OF REQUEST  
3 THE SOUTH LAKE COMMUNITY CONCERNS AT DORSEY HIGH SCHOOL WERE  
4 HEARD AND COUNCIL MEMBER HERB WESSON INTRODUCED A MOTION TO  
5 THE EXPO LINE BOARD, THAT ZEV YAROSLAVSKY AND SUPERVISOR BURKE  
6 BOTH SIT UPON, THAT WOULD HAVE REMOVED THE AT GRADE P.U.C.  
7 APPLICATION AT FARMDALE AND REPLACED IT WITH A GRADE SEPARATED  
8 OPTION, EITHER A STREET CLOSURE OR PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE, A TRAIN  
9 OVERCROSSING OR A TRAIN UNDERCROSSING. AFTER A CLOSED DOOR  
10 SESSION, THAT MEASURE WAS DEFERRED UNTIL THE NEXT MONTH. AND  
11 THE ONLY THING THAT HAPPENED BETWEEN THAT MEETING AND THE NEXT  
12 WAS ANOTHER COLLECTION OF WEST SIDE INTEREST GROUPS COMING  
13 TOGETHER TO DISCUSS THEIR REAL PRIORITIES, THE SUBWAY TO THE  
14 SEA AND EXPO. IN THE JANUARY 14TH CITY BEAT L.A. ARTICLE WHERE  
15 THEIR STAR SPEAKER AT THIS MEETING WAS ZEV YAROSLAVSKY, HE  
16 SAID, QUOTE, REFERENCING THE FARMDALE INTERSECTION, "THERE'S A  
17 CONTROVERSY THAT HAS ERUPTED ON ONE INTERSECTION ON THE LINE  
18 THAT THREATENS THE WHOLE LINE." HOW HE'S NEVER EXPLAINED. HE  
19 THEN WENT ON AND TO TELL THIS WEST SIDE COALITION, THAT IF  
20 THIS COALITION HAS ANY VALUE, ITS PRINCIPLE IS TO GIVE THE  
21 ELECTED OFFICIALS, WHO ARE THE ULTIMATE DECISION MAKERS IN  
22 THIS, THE COVER THE, BACKBONE, THE SAFETY NET. THUS YOUR AT  
23 GRADE APPLICATION GOES BEFORE THE P.U.C. NEXT WEEK. IT WAS NO  
24 SURPRISE THAT AFTER THIS MEETING AT THE NEXT BOARD MEETING  
25 WHERE THAT DECISION TO GRADE SEPARATE FARMDALE WAS DEFERRED



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 AND ELIMINATED THAT THESE PEOPLE, WHO PROBABLY NEVER HAD  
2 TRAVELED EAST OF LOS CIENEGA WITH THEIR CAR WINDOWS DOWN, CAME  
3 AND SPOKE IN OPPOSITION TO ANY CHANGE AT THE FARMDALE  
4 APPLICATION, AT THE FARMDALE CROSSING BECAUSE IT WOULD HAVE  
5 DELAYED THE OPENING OF A LINE, DELAYED THE OPENING OF A 100-  
6 YEAR PROJECT BY A MATTER OF MONTHS. SO NOW, AFTER WEST SIDE  
7 POLITICIANS AND MISTAKES HAVE FORCED EAST L.A. TO ACCEPT THE  
8 STREET LEVEL LINE, IT'S FORCED SOUTH L.A. TO ACCEPT THE STREET  
9 LEVEL LINE 15 FEET FROM DORSEY HIGH SCHOOL, WHERE 700 KIDS  
10 WALK ACROSS IN THE SPAN OF 15 MINUTES, YOUR COMMUNITY, THE  
11 WEST SIDE COMMUNITIES OF MIRACLE MILE, HANCOCK PARK, BEVERLY  
12 HILLS, AND CENTURY CITY, ARE DEMANDING A SUBWAY. SOME PEOPLE  
13 CALL THAT ENVIRONMENTAL INJUSTICE, ENVIRONMENTAL RACISM,  
14 INSTITUTIONAL DISCRIMINATION. I'M GOING TO BE VOTING NO AND  
15 I'M ENCOURAGING ANYONE WHO DARES TELL ME THAT WE NEED TO  
16 ACCEPT AN AT GRADE CROSSING AT FARMDALE AND AT WESTERN, WHERE  
17 FOSHAY IS, TO PAY FOR A SUBWAY TO THE SEA TO VOTE NO, AS WELL.  
18 THANK YOU.

19

20 **ARNOLD SACHS:** GOOD MORNING, COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,  
21 ARNOLD SACHS. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT YOU'RE LOOKING TO GET THIS  
22 HALF CENT SALES TAX ON THE BALLOT. THIS IS THE THIRD LONG-  
23 RANGE PLAN THAT YOU'RE DISCUSSING, THE LONG-RANGE PLAN OF  
24 1980, THE LONG-RANGE PLAN OF 2001. THANK GOD IT WAS AROUND SO  
25 THAT YOU COULD AMEND IT TO INCLUDE THE FUNDING FOR THE H.O.T.





**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 LANES. AND NOW THE 2008 PLAN. THE SERIOUS PROBLEM HERE IS THAT  
2 NOT ONE PROJECT THAT HAS BEEN STARTED UNDER YOUR TENURE AS  
3 COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HAS GONE TO COMPLETION. THE BLUE  
4 LINE, NOT COMPLETED. THE RED LINE, NOT COMPLETED. THE ORANGE  
5 LINE, NOT COMPLETED. THE GOLD LINE, NOT COMPLETED. CAR POOL  
6 LANES, NOT COMPLETED. THE ONLY THING THAT WAS COMPLETED  
7 ACCORDING TO THIS LIST THAT ARE ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THE LAST  
8 SEVEN YEARS SINCE THE 2001 PLAN WAS THE EASY TRANSIT PASS  
9 PROGRAM THAT WAS STARTED IN 2002. WHOOP DEEDOO. BIG DEAL. HOW  
10 MUCH FUNDING DID THAT TAKE? THE METRO GOLD LINE OPENED IN 2003  
11 FROM THE 1980 PLAN. THE BEGINNING CONSTRUCTION OF THE GOLD  
12 LINE EAST SIDE EXTENSION FROM THE 1980 PLAN. THE BEGINNING  
13 CONSTRUCTION OF THE EXPO LIGHT RAIL LINE IN 2006 FROM THE 1980  
14 PLAN. INSTEAD OF LOOKING AT A LONG-RANGE PLAN FOR 2008 OR  
15 2009, HOW ABOUT FINISHING UP THE LONG-RANGE PLAN FOR 2001? WE  
16 HEARD FROM SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH THAT THE FUNDING FOR THE  
17 PROGRAMS OR THE PROGRAMS WERE MADE UP FROM THE TOP M.T.A. TOP  
18 WORKING THEIR WAY DOWN. WHAT IS THE M.T.A. TOP? THAT WOULD BE  
19 THE BOARD OF -- I'M ASSUMING THAT WOULD BE THE COUNTY BOARD  
20 THAT MEETS AT M.T.A. AND DON'T THE FIVE OF YOU SIT ON THAT  
21 BOARD? SO HOW MUCH ABOVE THE FIVE OF YOU COULD THE CALL FOR  
22 PROJECTS BE? WHERE IS THAT? IS THAT YOUR HANDLERS THAT KEEP  
23 YOU IN OFFICE ALL THE TIME? ARE THOSE THE PEOPLE THAT ARE  
24 REALLY RUNNING THE COUNTY? THE CALL FOR PROJECTS, RUNNING DOWN  
25 THE RED LINE. WHEN THE MAYOR OPENED UP HIS LAST MEETING, HE



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 CALLED FOR \$4 BILLION TO COMPLETE THE SUBWAY TO THE SEA. THE  
2 L.A. TIMES ENDS UP WRITING A STORY ABOUT HOW THE \$4 BILLION  
3 WILL GET YOU TO WESTWOOD. WHERE DOES THAT INFORMATION COME  
4 FROM? THERE IS NO CONTINUATION HERE. IT'S ANALYSIS BY  
5 PARALYSIS. IT'S DIVIDE AND CONQUER. WE HEARD AT THE MEETING  
6 ABOUT POPULATIONS. WELL THE POPULATIONS MOVE. SUPERVISOR  
7 YAROSLAVSKY MENTIONED THAT THE CITIES GROW BY THIS COMMUTE.  
8 AND THAT WOULD BE THE CASE IN THE CITY OF INDUSTRY WOULD BE  
9 THE LARGEST BY PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN POPULATION. THERE'S ONLY  
10 LIKE 100 PEOPLE THAT LIVE THERE. THEN THE POPULATION TURNS  
11 INTO LIKE 1,000. SO SHOULD THEY GET A SUBWAY? SHOULD THEY GET  
12 A RAPID BUS LINE? SHOULD THEY GET CAR POOL LANES? SHOULD THEY  
13 GET A HOT LANE? SHOULD THEY GET ALL THIS STUFF BASED ON A  
14 PERCENTAGE? IF SOME PROJECT WAS COMPLETED IN THIS THIS COUNTY  
15 FROM START TO FINISH, IT WOULD BE THE SECOND MIRACLE. THANK  
16 YOU FOR YOUR TIME, YOUR ANSWERS AND YOUR ATTENTION.

17

18 **SUP. KNABE:** MADAME CHAIR?

19

20 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** SUPERVISOR KNABE?

21

22 **SUP. KNABE:** I'D LIKE TO ASK COUNTY COUNSEL A QUESTION AND ASK  
23 OUR REGISTRAR RECORDER DEAN LOGAN TO COME FORWARD, AS WELL. I  
24 WAS UNABLE TO ATTEND THE M.T.A. MEETING DUE TO A VERY  
25 CELEBRATORY DEAL, THE BIRTH OF MY FIRST GRANDSON. AND I WAS



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 NOT ABLE TO ARTICULATE MY OPPOSITION TO THE SALES TAX, PRETTY  
2 MUCH WHAT SOME OF THE OTHER SUPERVISORS' OPPOSITION IS. BUT I  
3 ALSO THINK IT'S THE WRONG TIME WITH THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY  
4 TO BE ASKING OUR POPULACE TO ADD ON ADDITIONAL SALES TAX. AND  
5 NOW THIS MORNING THE GOVERNOR'S TALKING ABOUT ADDITIONAL SALES  
6 TAX. AND NOT ONLY THE IMPACT ON OUR CONSTITUENTS BUT THE  
7 IMPACT ON BUSINESS AND JUST DRIVING BUSINESSES OUT OF  
8 CALIFORNIA. A CONCERN IS THIS, ONE IS I'D LIKE TO KNOW FROM A  
9 LEGAL STANDPOINT AND THEN I WILL ASK THE REGISTRAR RECORDER  
10 ABOUT COSTS. BUT IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING, THAT A NO VOTE HERE  
11 TODAY, SAY IT DOES NOT PASS, TO PUT IT ON THE BALLOT. IT IS  
12 REALLY JUST A SYMBOLIC VOTE, BECAUSE THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO  
13 WAY LEGALLY WE CAN PREVENT THIS ITEM BECAUSE IT WAS REQUESTED  
14 BY THE M.T.A. BOARD ON A 9-VOTE MAJORITY TO GO ON THE BALLOT.  
15 AND WHAT WOULD HAPPEN WOULD BE THAT IT WOULD NOT BE  
16 CONSOLIDATED WITH OUR REGULAR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION BUT WOULD  
17 FORCE THE REGISTRAR RECORDER TO HAVE A DIFFERENT BALLOT, A  
18 DIFFERENT VOTERS' GUIDE AND EVERYTHING ELSE, WHICH WOULD BE  
19 VERY, VERY EXPENSIVE AND OF COURSE ULTIMATELY THAT PERSON  
20 PAYING FOR THAT IS OUR TAXPAYER. AND SO, ONE, IS THAT TRUE?  
21 THAT WE CANNOT -- A NO VOTE HERE IS SYMBOLIC. IT DOES NOT  
22 PREVENT IT FROM GOING ON THE BALLOT? SPEAKER: MADAME CHAIR,  
23 AND SUPERVISOR KNABE, CONGRATULATIONS ON YOU GRANDSON. YES,  
24 THAT IS ABSOLUTELY THE WAY STATE LAW OPERATES. THE  
25 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY CALLED THE ELECTION



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 PURSUANT TO STATE LAW FOR THE NOVEMBER GENERAL ELECTION DATE.  
2 WHEN THAT OCCURS, OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE ELECTIONS CODE  
3 REQUIRE THAT THAT ELECTION BE CONSOLIDATED WITH THE COUNTY'S  
4 ELECTIONS FOR THE STATEWIDE FOR THAT DATE. AND THE BOARD DOES  
5 HAVE LIMITED DISCRETION TO REFUSE TO CONSOLIDATE. AND THAT IS  
6 WHERE IF THE BOARD FINDS THAT THE BALANCE STYLE VOTING  
7 EQUIPMENT OR COMPUTER CAPACITY IS SUCH THAT THE ADDITIONAL  
8 ELECTION CANNOT BE HANDLED, THAT IS THE ONLY BASIS UPON WHICH  
9 THE BOARD CAN DENY A REQUEST FOR CONSOLIDATION, OTHERWISE THE  
10 MEASURE WILL ULTIMATELY -- WOULD ULTIMATELY BE CONSOLIDATED  
11 WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION. SO THEN FAST FORWARD, MR. LOGAN.  
12 THE COST TO THE TAXPAYERS OF ALLOWING THIS VOTE TO GO FORWARD  
13 AS A CONSOLIDATED MEASURE AND LETTING THE TAXPAYERS, I MEAN  
14 THE VOTERS DECIDE OR IS THE COST OF HAVING A SEPARATE BALLOT,  
15 SEPARATE SAMPLE BALLOT, SEPARATE, ALL ELECTION MATERIALS AND  
16 EVERYTHING ELSE.

17

18 **DEAN LOGAN:** SUPERVISOR, OUR ESTIMATE OF THE COST TO THE M.T.A.  
19 FOR THE CONSOLIDATED ELECTION, IF IT IS CONSOLIDATED ONTO THE  
20 NOVEMBER 4TH COUNTY ELECTION WOULD BE APPROXIMATELY 7.2  
21 MILLION. THE IMPACT OF RUNNING IT AS A SEPARATE CONCURRENT  
22 ELECTION WOULD RAISE THOSE COSTS FOR THE M.T.A. I DON'T HAVE  
23 AN EXACT ESTIMATE ON THAT BALLPARK. AND THIS IS A VERY, VERY  
24 ROUGH BALLPARK AT THIS POINT, I WOULD SAY IS SOMEWHERE IN THE  
25 RANGE OF 9 TO \$10 MILLION TO DO THAT SEPARATELY AS YOU



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 ARTICULATED. IT'S PRINTING SEPARATE BALLOTS. IT'S DOING A  
2 SEPARATE MAILING TO VOTE BY MAIL VOTERS. IT'S DOING A SEPARATE  
3 MAILING AND PRINTING OF THE SAMPLE BALLOT FOR THAT MEASURE, AS  
4 WELL. THE ADDITIONAL IMPACT OF THAT IS THE COST TO L.A. COUNTY  
5 AND TO THE OTHER DISTRICTS THAT HAVE MEASURES ON THE GENERAL  
6 ELECTION BALLOT ON THE CONSOLIDATED BALLOT WOULD ALSO BE  
7 IMPACTED BY THAT BECAUSE THEIR PRORATED SHARE WOULD BE  
8 IMPACTED BY NOT HAVING THE M.T.A. ON THE CONSOLIDATED BALLOT.

9

10 **SUP. KNABE:** SO THERE WOULD BE ADDITIONAL COSTS IN ADDITION TO  
11 IF M.T.A. VOTE BECAUSE OF NOT BEING ABLE TO PRORATE THAT.

12

13 **DEAN LOGAN:** CORRECT.

14

15 **SUP. KNABE:** I JUST DO NOT SUPPORT THE MEASURE. I WOULD HAVE  
16 VOTED NO AT THE M.T.A. HAD I BEEN THERE. IT STILL WOULD HAVE  
17 PASSED TO GO FORWARD. BUT ALSO, AS I FEEL SO STRONGLY IT IS  
18 THE WRONG TIME TO ASK THE VOTERS TO TAX THEMSELVES AGAIN AT  
19 THIS PARTICULAR POINT, I THINK IT'S WRONG FOR US TO ALSO ASK  
20 THE TAXPAYERS TO PICK UP ADDITIONAL COSTS ON WHAT WOULD BE A  
21 VERY SYMBOLIC VOTE. I AM NOT GOING TO SUPPORT THE SALES TAX  
22 MEASURE. ON OR OFF THE BALLOT. I THINK IT'S THE WRONG TIME. I  
23 THINK THERE'S AN ISSUE OF EQUITY. BUT I ALSO DON'T THINK THAT  
24 WE SHOULD ASK THE TAXPAYERS OF THIS COUNTY TO PICK UP SEVERAL  
25 MILLION MORE DOLLARS IN COSTS BECAUSE OF A SYMBOLIC VOTE OF



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 NO. THERE'S OTHER WAYS FOR US TO OPPOSE THIS, THOSE OF US THAT  
2 DO OPPOSE THE SALES TAX MEASURE. BUT I DON'T THINK THAT THE  
3 BALLOT, AND NOT ALLOWING THE TAXPAYERS THEMSELVES. NOT TO PICK  
4 UP THE ADDITIONAL COSTS BUT TO LET THE VOTERS DECIDE WHETHER  
5 OR NOT THIS IS A GOOD OR BAD IDEA THAT WE SHOULD ASK THE  
6 TAXPAYERS TO PICK UP AN ADDITIONAL 3, 4, \$5 MILLION. SO THAT  
7 WAS MY QUESTION AND MY CONCERN.

8

9 **SUP. ANTONOVICH:** I WOULD JUST SAY THAT THE M.T.A., IF BOARD  
10 DID NOT SUPPORT PLACING THIS ON THE BALLOT WOULD HAVE THAT  
11 OPPORTUNITY TO ALSO SEE WHAT WAS IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE  
12 TAXPAYERS AND THEN GO BACK AND REDRAW A PROPOSAL THAT HAS AN  
13 OPPORTUNITY OF BEING ENACTED AND BEING PASSED AND THEY WOULD  
14 BE DOING THE TAXPAYERS A GREAT DEAL OF PROVIDING SOME  
15 LEADERSHIP AND DIRECTION AND CONSIDERING THE IMPACT THAT THIS  
16 WOULD HAVE ON THEIR COMMUNITIES. IT'S LIKE IN A TOTALITARIAN  
17 COUNTRY WHERE THEY SAY, "WELL, I WAS JUST FOLLOWING ORDERS."  
18 WELL, SOMEBODY HAS TO STAND UP AND SAY, "THIS IS NONSENSE."  
19 AND PERHAPS THIS REJECTION TODAY WOULD ALLOW THE M.T.A. TO RE-  
20 EVALUATE WHAT THEY ARE ASKING TO BE PLACED ON THE BALLOT AND  
21 PLACE ONE THAT HAS AN OPPORTUNITY OF BEING SUCCESSFUL INSTEAD  
22 OF WASTING MILLIONS OF DOLLARS AND NOT ACHIEVING THE TWO-  
23 THIRDS VOTE BY BASICALLY WRITING OFF A 90 PERCENT OF THE  
24 COUNTY'S TRANSIT NEEDS.

25





**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1   **SUP. KNABE:** TOTALLY AGREE, MIKE. BUT YOU DIDN'T LISTEN TO WHAT  
2   THE ATTORNEY SAID. WE HAVE NO ABILITY, NO RIGHT TO DO THAT.  
3   WE'RE GOING TO ASK THE TAXPAYERS TO PICK UP AN ADDITIONAL 3 TO  
4   \$5 MILLION IN COSTS.

5

6   **SUP. ANTONOVICH:** OUR ATTORNEYS ARE GIVING YOU A SUGGESTION.  
7   BUT AS YOU AND I BOTH KNOW THEY HAVE NOT BEEN 100 PERCENT  
8   ACCURATE ON A NUMBER OF CASES. AND THE COURTS WILL MAKE THAT  
9   DETERMINATION. AND I WOULD RATHER HAVE A TRANSIT PROPOSAL WITH  
10   THE M.T.A. GOING BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD AND GETTING ONE  
11   THAT HAS AN OPPORTUNITY THAT WE CAN ALL SUPPORT AND GETTING  
12   REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION THAT THIS COUNTY NEEDS INSTEAD OF  
13   GIVING THEM A MAKE BELIEVE PROCESS THAT THEY BELIEVE IS GOING  
14   TO SOLVE A SERIOUS PROBLEM AND IT'S NOT.

15

16   **SUP. KNABE:** WHAT DO THE COURTS MEAN? DOES SOMEBODY HAVE TO SUE  
17   TO GET IT ON THE BALLOT? WHAT'S HE TALKING ABOUT, THAT THE  
18   COURTS WOULD DECIDE? YOU'RE TELLING ME THAT WE JUST DON'T HAVE  
19   -- THIS IS A SYMBOLIC NO VOTE. WHAT IS HE REFERRING TO BY  
20   GOING TO COURT?

21

22   **RAY FORTNER, COUNSEL:** THE BOARD'S DETERMINATION NOT TO  
23   CONSOLIDATE THE ELECTION WOULD, BY STATUTE, THE STATUTE SEEMS  
24   TO AFFIRMATIVELY SAY THE ELECTION SHALL BE CONSOLIDATED. THE  
25   PRACTICE HAS ALWAYS BEEN FOR THE REQUEST TO COME TO THE BOARD



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 AND BE APPROVED HERE OR DENIED, WHICH I DON'T BELIEVE, IN MY  
2 MEMORY, HAS OCCURRED. WITH THAT, AND IF THE REGISTRAR DID NOT  
3 PROCEED TO ACT IN AN ADMINISTERIAL FASHION TO CONSOLIDATE,  
4 THEN THEY WOULD HAVE TO TAKE IT TO COURT, AND AT THAT POINT,  
5 THE THE COURT WOULD DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT THERE WAS A BASIS  
6 FOR THE BOARD TO REFUSE TO ORDER THE CONSOLIDATION.

7

8 **SUP. ANTONOVICH:** OR THEY COULD DECIDE--

9

10 **RAY FORTNER, COUNSEL:** BUT THE ELECTION ITSELF WOULD PROCEED.  
11 IT WOULD JUST BE CONCURRENT RATHER THAN CONSOLIDATED.

12

13 **SUP. KNABE:** YEAH, I MEAN IN OTHER WORDS, THE ELECTION, I'M  
14 TRYING TO ADDRESS MR. ANTONOVICH'S ISSUE OF SAYING LET'S GO  
15 BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD. I TOTALLY AGREE WITH THAT. BUT  
16 WHETHER THE COURT DECIDES IN OUR FAVOR OR AGAINST US, THE  
17 ELECTION IS GOING TO GO FORWARD, WHETHER IT'S CONSOLIDATED OR  
18 WHETHER IT'S INDEPENDENT. WE ARE NOT GOING, THERE IS NOTHING  
19 THERE TO STOP THE ELECTION BY STATUTE AND BY LAW. IS THAT  
20 CORRECT?

21

22 **RAY FORTNER, COUNSEL:** THAT'S CORRECT.

23

24 **SUP. ANTONOVICH:** THE L.A. CITY ALWAYS HAS BLOCK VOTING. THEY  
25 WILL NOT ALLOW THEIR VOTERS TO VOTE CONCSIENCE. IF THE L.A.





**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 CITY WOULD SEE WHAT WAS IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE COUNTY AS  
2 A WHOLE, THEY WOULD HAVE THAT OPPORTUNITY TO GO BACK TO THE  
3 DRAWING BOARD AND AGAIN, HAVING A PROPOSAL THAT WOULD MEET  
4 EVERYBODY'S TRANSIT NEEDS AND WE COULD ALL SUPPORT, PERIOD.

5

6 **SUP. KNABE:** I AGREE. BUT WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN? I MEAN, WE  
7 CAN'T STOP THE VOTE.

8

9 **SUP. ANTONOVICH:** WE COULD HAVE M.T.A. RECONSIDER THEIR  
10 PROPOSAL.

11

12 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** ALL RIGHT. IT'S MOVED BY YAROSLAVSKY.  
13 SECONDED BY BURKE. PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

14

15 **CLERK SACHI HAMAI:** SUPERVISOR MOLINA?

16

17 **SUP. MOLINA:** I ABSTAIN.

18

19 **CLERK SACHI HAMAI:** SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY?

20

21 **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** YES.

22

23 **CLERK SACHI HAMAI:** SUPERVISOR KNABE?

24

25 **SUP. KNABE:** NO.



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1

2 **CLERK SACHI HAMAI:** SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH?

3

4 **SUP. ANTONOVICH:** NO.

5

6 **CLERK SACHI HAMAI:** SUPERVISOR BURKE?

7

8 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** AYE. THE MEASURE DOES NOT PASS.

9

10 **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** SO LET ME JUST, MADAME CHAIR, CAN I ASK A  
11 QUESTION NOW? HEY DEAN? WHERE DID DEAN GO? I WANT TO BE SURE  
12 THAT EVERYONE UNDERSTANDS, ESPECIALLY THE M.T.A., WHAT THEY  
13 NEED TO DO AT THIS POINT. SO AT THIS POINT, WHAT'S THE NEXT  
14 STEP FOR THE M.T.A., WHICH VOTED TO PLACE THIS ON THE BALLOT?

15

16 **DEAN LOGAN:** WELL, MY UNDERSTANDING FROM COUNTY COUNSEL IS THE  
17 M.T.A. BOARD HAS ALREADY PLACED THE BALLOT.

18

19 **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** CORRECT, PASSED A RESOLUTION.

20

21 **DEAN LOGAN:** WITHOUT CONSOLIDATING IT, BECAUSE I'M STATUTORILY  
22 THE ELECTION OFFICIAL FOR THE M.T.A., MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT  
23 I WILL HAVE TO PROCEED TO CONDUCT THAT AS A CONCURRENT  
24 ELECTION.

25



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1   **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** OKAY. AND SO YOU WILL CHARGE THE M.T.A.  
2   WHATEVER THE ADDED COSTS ARE?

3

4   **DEAN LOGAN:** THE FULL COST OF THAT CONCURRENT ELECTION, YES.

5

6   **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** YOU ESTIMATE 9, \$10 MILLION BUT IT WAS A  
7   VERY ROUGH ESTIMATE.

8

9   **DEAN LOGAN:** CORRECT.

10

11   **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** WHEN THE ELECTION IS CONDUCTED, ARE THERE  
12   TWO SEPARATE BALLOTS THAT ARE ACTUALLY -- THERE WILL BE ONE  
13   BALLOT FOR PRESIDENT, CONGRESS ALL THE OTHER PROPOSITIONS, AND  
14   THEN ANOTHER SEPARATE BALLOT FOR THE MEASURE.

15

16   **DEAN LOGAN:** THAT'S CORRECT. THERE WILL BE THE CONSOLIDATED  
17   BALLOT WHICH IS THE TYPICAL BALLOT THAT L.A. COUNTY VOTERS ARE  
18   USED TO THAT THEY TAKE INTO THE BOOTH AND THEY HAVE THE  
19   MULTIPLE PAGES IN THE BOOTH. THEN SEPARATELY THEY WOULD BE  
20   GIVEN A BALLOT THAT HAS THE M.T.A. MEASURE ACTUALLY PRINTED ON  
21   THE BALLOT AND THEY WOULD HAVE TO FILL IN THEIR VOTE ON THAT  
22   BALLOT IN ADDITION TO THEIR REGULAR BALLOT, AND THOSE WOULD BE  
23   TABULATED SEPARATELY.

24



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1   **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** AND WILL THEY BE THE SAME TECHNOLOGY BE USED  
2   FOR THE BALLOT, THE MEASURE R BALLOT, WHICH IS THE M.T.A.  
3   BALLOT?

4

5   **DEAN LOGAN:** I CAN'T COMPLETELY ANSWER THAT AT THIS POINT  
6   BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW THAT OUR VOTING SYSTEM HAS THE ABILITY,  
7   THE TECHNOLOGY, NOT THE COUNTING TECHNOLOGY, BUT THE PRECINCT  
8   TECHNOLOGY. I DON'T KNOW THAT IT HAS THE ABILITY TO CHECK TWO  
9   DIFFERENT ELECTIONS. SO IT'S LIKELY THAT THE CONSOLIDATED  
10   ELECTION, THE PRESIDENTIAL CONGRESSIONAL AND ALL THAT, THOSE  
11   WOULD GO THROUGH THE PRECINCT BALLOT READERS TO CHECK FOR OVER  
12   VOTES AND BLANK BALLOTS. THE M.T.A. BALLOTS MAY HAVE TO JUST  
13   GO INTO A BALLOT BOX SEPARATELY BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW THAT THE  
14   EQUIPMENT HAS THE ABILITY TO -- I'D HAVE TO CHECK ON THAT.

15

16   **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** IF THEY DON'T HAVE THE ABILITY, THEN HOW  
17   WOULD YOU CONDUCT THE MEASURE R ELECTION? THE M.T.A. ELECTION?

18

19   **DEAN LOGAN:** WELL, WE WOULD CONDUCT IT AS A SEPARATE ELECTION,  
20   AS A PAPER BALLOT. THE VOTERS WOULD MARK THOSE BALLOTS.

21

22   **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** WITH A PEN?

23

24   **DEAN LOGAN:** YES. THEY WOULD MARK THEM WITH A PEN. THEY WOULD  
25   COME BACK AND BE COUNTED CENTRALLY AT OUR LOCATION IN NORWALK.



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1

2 **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** WOULD THEY BE MANUALLY COUNTED?

3

4 **DEAN LOGAN:** NO, THEY WOULD BE COUNTED THROUGH OUR VOTE  
5 TABULATION SYSTEM. I'M NOT SURE AT WHAT POINT THEY WOULD BE  
6 COUNTED BECAUSE WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A LOT OF BALLOTS TO COUNT  
7 ON NOVEMBER 4TH. THAT'S A LEVEL OF COMPLICATION THAT I NEED TO  
8 GO BACK AND TALK WITH MY STAFF ABOUT HOW WE WOULD DO THAT.

9

10 **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** OBVIOUSLY, THIS COMPLICATES THE JOB OF THE  
11 POLL WORKERS AS WELL. THEY WILL HAVE TWO SETS OF DOCUMENTS TO  
12 --

13

14 **DEAN LOGAN:** THE POLL WORKERS WOULD NEED TO ISSUE TWO BALLOTS  
15 TO EVERY VOTER. WE WOULD ALSO IN OUR OFFICE, WE WOULD NEED TO  
16 DO SEPARATE MAILINGS TO ALL OF OUR VOTE-BY-MAIL VOTERS. AND WE  
17 WOULD ALSO HAVE TO DO A SEPARATE SAMPLE BALLOT MAILING COUNTY  
18 WIDE.

19

20 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** SUPERVISOR KNABE.

21

22 **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** I WASN'T DONE.

23

24 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** I'M SORRY.

25



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1    **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** BUT I'M HAPPY TO YIELD.

2

3    **SUP. KNABE:** THE THING THAT I WANTED TO FOLLOW-UP ON WAS THE  
4    QUESTION THAT DEAN JUST ANSWERED, AND THAT WAS THE FACT THAT  
5    HE IS ELECTIONS OFFICIAL FOR THE M.T.A. EARLIER IN, CASTING MY  
6    NO VOTE. YOU INDICATED THAT M.T.A. WOULD HAVE TO GO TO COURT  
7    AND LET THE COURT DECIDE. THAT NOT THE CASE. THE CASE IS THAT  
8    IT'S GOING TO GO TO THE BALLOT ONE WAY OR THE OTHER. THERE IS  
9    NO JUDGE INVOLVED. THERE IS NO JURY INVOLVED. EXCUSE ME, I'M  
10   ASKING. WHAT THE REGISTRAR RECORDER INDICATED AND WHAT MR.  
11   ANTONOVICH INDICATED, TWO SEPARATE THINGS. SO NOW I'M ASKING  
12   COUNTY COUNSEL.

13

14   **DEAN LOGAN:** MADAM CHAIR, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, THE ELECTION  
15   WILL BE CONDUCTED BY THE REGISTRAR RECORDER AS THE ELECTIONS  
16   OFFICIAL FOR THE M.T.A. THE ONLY QUESTION IS WHETHER IT WILL  
17   BE CONSOLIDATED OR NOT ON THE BALLOT OR WILL IT BE A SEPARATE  
18   BALLOT.

19

20   **SUP. KNABE:** SO THE M.T.A. WILL HAVE TO GO TO COURT TO  
21   CONSOLIDATE.

22

23   **DEAN LOGAN:** IN AN EFFORT TO CONSOLIDATE, YES.

24



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1    **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** MAY I JUST SAY. AND THE ISSUE IS WHETHER OR  
2    NOT WHAT WE HAVE IS ADMINISTERIAL ACT, ISN'T THAT IT? THAT  
3    THEY WOULD PROBABLY, THE COURT WOULD DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT  
4    A WRIT OF MANDATE CAN ISSUE TO DIRECT US, BECAUSE IT'S A  
5    MINISTERIAL ACT RATHER THAN A DISCRETIONARY ACT.

6

7    **DEAN LOGAN:** THAT'S CORRECT, MADAME CHAIR. THE ELECTION CODE  
8    DIRECTS THAT HE ELECTION SHALL BE CONSOLIDATED --

9

10   **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** BUT THE COURT WILL DECIDE IF THE M.T.A. --  
11   DON, IF THE M.T.A. CHOOSES TO ARGUE WITH US AND GO TO COURT.  
12   I'M TRYING TO UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'VE SAID, BECAUSE I HAS BEEN  
13   A LITTLE BIT CONFUSING. BUT AS I UNDERSTAND IT, THAT IF THEY  
14   DO NOTHING, THERE WILL BE TWO SEPARATE AND CONCURRENT  
15   ELECTIONS HELD, WITH ALL THE CONFUSION AND COSTS ATTENDANT  
16   THERETO. IF THE M.T.A. DECIDES TO SUE AND SEEK A WRIT OF  
17   MANDATE TO FORCE THE CONSOLIDATION, THEN IT CAN BE  
18   CONSOLIDATED. EITHER WAY, THERE WILL BE AN ELECTION. SO NOW  
19   THE QUESTION IS WHETHER THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WANTS TO  
20   FORCE THE M.T.A. TO SPEND THE MONEY AND GO TO COURT, TAKE THE  
21   COURT'S TIME TO HAVE AN ELECTION THAT WILL COST LESS AND WILL  
22   OFFER LESS CONFUSION. AND BY THE ACTION WE'VE JUST TAKEN, WE  
23   ARE FORCING THAT TO HAPPEN. IF MIKE ANTONOVICH, WHO GOT HIS  
24   LAW DEGREE THE SAME PLACE I DID IS RIGHT AND THE COURT SIDES  
25   WITH US, THEN ALL WE'VE DONE IS ACCOMPLISHED A MORE EXPENSIVE





**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 AND MORE CONFUSING ELECTION. I HONESTLY DON'T -- I THOUGHT YOU  
2 WERE RIGHT THE FIRST TIME. THIS IS NOT -- THE DEBATE HERE IS  
3 NOT ABOUT THE SUBSTANCE OF THE MATTER. THAT WAS THE DEBATE  
4 THAT HAPPENED AT THE BOARD OF THE M.T.A. LAST MONTH. AND IT'S  
5 THE DEBATE THAT WILL TAKE PLACE FOR THE NEXT THREE MONTHS ALL  
6 OVER THIS COUNTY. IF THIS IS A BAD PLAN, CAMPAIGN AGAINST IT.  
7 BUT THE DECISION OF THE M.T.A. TO PUT IT ON THE BALLOT HAS  
8 BEEN MADE. OUR ISSUE HERE IS ONLY WHETHER WE'RE GOING TO MAKE  
9 LIFE MORE COMPLICATED FOR THE VOTERS, FOR THE REGISTRAR, AND  
10 THEN IF WE END UP HAVING A MESS-UP AT SEVERAL OF OUR POLLING  
11 PLACES, I HOPE WE DON'T TURN ON MR. LOGAN AND SAY "WHOA".

12

13 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** SUPERVISOR KNABE, AND THEN SUPERVISOR  
14 MOLINA.

15

16 **SUP. KNABE:** I WOULD JUST THEN, MADAME CHAIR, I WOULD MOVE FOR  
17 RECONSIDERATION.

18

19 **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** SECOND.

20

21 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** SUPERVISOR MOLINA, WOULD YOU CARE TO SPEAK  
22 AT THIS POINT?

23

24 **SUP. MOLINA:** YES, I WOULD.

25





**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1    **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** YES, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED.

2

3    **SUP. MOLINA:** IT'S INTERESTING. DON, WHILE YOU WERE WELCOMING  
4    YOUR NEW GRANDSON, SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY MADE A MOTION TO GO  
5    TO COURT ON THIS ITEM. SO IT HAS BEEN --

6

7    **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** EXCUSE ME. FOR THE RECORD. THE MOTION I MADE  
8    WAS TO GIVE THE M.T.A. THE OPTION OF GOING. BECAUSE WE WEREN'T  
9    GOING TO MEET AGAIN.

10

11    **SUP. MOLINA:** IF I REMEMBER CORRECTLY, IT WAS THE  
12    AUTHORIZATION. THE AUTHORIZATION TO GO TO COURT TO FIGHT THIS  
13    ISSUE.

14

15    **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** THAT'S TRUE.

16

17    **SUP. MOLINA:** HERE WE HAVE A STRATEGY. THERE WAS A STRATEGY AT  
18    THE M.T.A. AND IT WAS A VERY CLEAR STRATEGY. IT WAS LET'S  
19    FIGURE OUT WHO'S GOING TO GET THE BIG PIE. AND THROUGH  
20    LEGISLATORS AND OTHERS, THEY CAN COP TO THE SCHEME. AND I HAVE  
21    SAID IF THE VERY BEGINNING THAT IF WE WANT THIS TAX, WHICH IS  
22    A TWO-THIRDS TAX TO PASS, AND I THINK MANY OF US UNDERSTAND  
23    AND RECOGNIZE HOW SIGNIFICANTLY IMPORTANT A TRANSIT TAX IS TO  
24    ALL OF US. OF COURSE, I DON'T KNOW THAT IT IS AT THIS POINT IN  
25    TIME CONSIDERING THAT THE STATE IS NOW LOOKING AT LEVYING



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1    ADDITIONAL SALES TAX, AS WELL. SO WE MIGHT RECONSIDER AS TO  
2    WHETHER THIS IS A PROPER TIME OR WE SHOULD WAIT. BUT THE WAY  
3    IT WAS DONE AT THE M.T.A. CERTAINLY WASN'T BY ANY WAY KIND OF  
4    A FAIR PROCESS "LET'S BE FAIR TO THE VOTERS." ALL OF THAT. IT  
5    WAS A NICE CONCOCTED SCHEME THAT WENT ON. AND EVERY SINGLE AND  
6    EVERY STEP OF THE WAY IT HAS MADE ARRANGEMENTS AT HOW THEY  
7    WERE GOING TO GET MORE FOR ONE SIDE OF TOWN VERSUS THE OTHER  
8    SIDE. THEY HAVE BEEN TRYING TO FIGURE OUT -- AND EVERYONE HAS  
9    KNOWN FROM THE BEGINNING THAT THE M.T.A. IS REALLY HEAVILY  
10    LOADED WHEN IT COMES TO THE MAYOR'S VOTES ON THERE. AND VERY  
11    CLEARLY IF ANYBODY WOULD HAVE OBJECTED, THAT ARE HIS  
12    APPOINTEES, HE CERTAINLY PROBABLY WOULD HAVE WITHDRAWN THEM  
13    RIGHT THERE AND THEN. SO LET'S NOT TALK ABOUT FAIRNESS IN  
14    LIGHT OF HOW THIS ALL CAME ABOUT. I THINK IT'S HYPOCRITICAL TO  
15    TALK ABOUT FAIRNESS WHEN IT WAS BROUGHT ABOUT SO UNFAIRLY TO  
16    THE M.T.A. BOARD AFTER WE HAVE SPENT YEARS AND YEARS LOOKING  
17    AT A CRITERIA FOR A 30-YEAR TRANSIT PLAN. MANY OF US HAD  
18    DEVOTED TIME. AND ALL OF A SUDDEN IN THE BACK ROOM THEY MADE  
19    THOSE KIND OF ARRANGEMENTS. NOW, MY ISSUE IS THAT I WISH IT  
20    WOULD HAVE BEEN FAIR BUT IT WASN'T FAIR. AND THE ONLY  
21    OPPORTUNITY THAT I HAVE WAS TO RAISE MY VOICE, RAISE MY  
22    CONCERNS AND MY VOTE. MY VOTE WAS VERY IMPORTANT. RIGHT NOW  
23    I'M BEING TOLD MY VOTE IS INSIGNIFICANT. AND IT HAS NOTHING TO  
24    DO WITH ANYTHING, THAT I'M SUPPOSED TO APPROVE IT BECAUSE IT'S  
25    GOING TO GO ANY WAY. THEY ARE STILL GOING TO HAVE AN



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 OPPORTUNITY TO PUT IT ON THE BALLOT. ALL THEY HAVE TO DO IS GO  
2 UP TO THAT VOTING BOOTH AND SAY: CAN I HAVE THAT SPECIAL  
3 TRANSIT TAX BALLOT? AND I CAN GO AND VOTE FOR IT. THAT IS WHAT  
4 IT'S GOING TO MEAN. IT WILL BE VERY UNIQUE AND VERY SPECIAL.  
5 AND I'M SURE THE MAYOR AND HIS COMMERCIALS WILL PROBABLY  
6 CAMPAIGN TOWARD ALL OF IT, OR THEY WILL DO WHAT THEY INTENDED  
7 TO DO AT THE M.T.A. MEETING WHEN THEY AUTHORIZED, AGAIN WITH  
8 THE SMALL NUMBER OF VOTES THAT THEY HAD, TO GO TO COURT IF  
9 NEED BE. SO HERE'S A STRATEGY, AS WELL. THE STRATEGY CAN BE IF  
10 YOU'RE OPPOSED TO THIS TAX NOW, AS IT STANDS. WE HAVE AN  
11 OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE IT VERY, VERY UNIQUE IN KIND OF THE SAME  
12 SYMBOLIC WAY THAT IT BROUGHT IT AND MADE IT VERY UNIQUE TO US.  
13 THEY CAN GO INTO THE BALLOT BOOTH. AND THEY CAN GO IN THERE  
14 AND ASK FOR THAT SPECIAL BALLOT WITH SPECIAL HANDLING TO VOTE  
15 FOR THIS. SO WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO DO THAT. NOW, I THINK  
16 IT'S VERY CLEARLY, WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY BY OUR VOTE. I KNOW  
17 WHAT MY VOTE IS. I DID NOT SUPPORT IT AT THE M.T.A. FOR ALL  
18 THE REASONS THAT SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH RAISED AND I'M NOT  
19 GOING TO SUPPORT IT HERE AT ALL. SO WE ALL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY  
20 TO MAKE THAT DECISION. LET THEM DO WHAT THEY'RE GOING TO DO  
21 BECAUSE AT THE END OF THE DAY, THAT'S HOW THEY'RE -- THEY EVEN  
22 TRIED TO TABLE OUR DISCUSSION, BY THE WAY, SO THAT WE WOULDN'T  
23 EVEN HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS IT. SO IT'S BEEN A VERY  
24 FUNNY WAY THAT THIS LITTLE CHOO-CHOO IS GETTING ON THE BALLOT.  
25 BUT THE REALITY IS YOU HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY HERE TO EXPRESS TO



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1 THE VOTERS THAT IF THEY WANT TO HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO VOTE  
2 FOR THIS, THEY CAN GO IN AND ASK FOR THAT SPECIAL BALLOT TO  
3 TAX THEMSELVES FOR A VERY UNFAIR TRANSIT TAX FOR THE NEXT 30  
4 YEARS.

5

6 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** ALL RIGHT THE MOTION IS ON THE --

7

8 **SUP. KNABE:** THE QUESTION IS WOULD THEY HAVE TO ASK FOR THE  
9 BALLOT?

10

11 **DEAN LOGAN:** NO. IF WE'RE CONDUCTING THE ELECTION, WE HAVE TO  
12 GIVE THEM THE BALLOT.

13

14 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** YOU WOULD HAVE TO GIVE THEM THE BALLOT. ON  
15 THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER, WOULD YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

16

17 **CLERK SACHI HAMAI:** SUPERVISOR MOLINA?

18

19 **SUP. MOLINA:** NO.

20

21 **CLERK SACHI HAMAI:** SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY?

22

23 **SUP. YAROSLAVSKY:** YES.

24

25 **CLERK SACHI HAMAI:** SUPERVISOR KNABE?



**The Meeting Transcript of  
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors**

1

2 **SUP. KNABE:** NO.

3

4 **CLERK SACHI HAMAI:** SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH?

5

6 **SUP. ANTONOVICH:** NO.

7

8 **SUP. KNABE:** I ANSWERED MY QUESTION.

9

10 **CLERK SACHI HAMAI:** SUPERVISOR BURKE.

11

12 **SUP. BURKE, CHAIR:** AYE. THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER FAILS. THE  
13 NEXT ITEM, I BELIEVE SUPERVISOR KNABE --

14

15 **SUP. KNABE:** I DIDN'T HAVE ANY MORE ITEMS. YOU HAD 24 AND 30  
16 STILL ON THE AGENDA.

17

18 **SUP. ANTONOVICH:** MY ADJOURNMENTS, WE LOST A WONDERFUL DEPUTY  
19 SHERIFF THIS PAST WEEK, JUAN ABLE ESCALANTE, AGE 27 WHO HAD  
20 BEEN WITH THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT FOR THE PAST 2-1/2 YEARS,  
21 AND ALSO SERVED IN IRAQ. HE WAS GUNNED DOWN SATURDAY OUTSIDE  
22 HIS BOYHOOD HOME IN CYPRUS PARK. AND HE'S BEEN ASSIGNED TO  
23 GUARD THE MOST DANGEROUS INMATES IN THE COUNTY, INCLUDING  
24 MEMBERS OF THE MEXICAN MAFIA GANG. HE IS SURVIVED BY HIS WIFE  
25 AND HIS THREE CHILDREN. AND I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO MOVE THAT WE